

Document title

A **HISTORY** OF THE National Woman's Rights Movement, FOR TWENTY YEARS, With Proceedings of the Decade Meeting held at Apollo Hall, October 20, 1870, FROM 1850 TO 1870, WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT DURING THE WINTER OF 1871, IN THE NATIONAL CAPITOL, COMPILED BY PAULINA W. DAVIS.

NEW YORK: JOURNEYMEN PRINTERS' CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, No. 30 Beekman Street. 1871.

REPORT OF Proceedings of the Twentieth Anniversary, AND OF THE RECEPTION HELD AT THE ST. JAMES HOTEL.

In August, 1869, it was announced in a Convention held in Newport, R. I., that the second Decade of the National Women's Rights Movement would occur on the 19th and 20th of October, 1870, and that a committee must be appointed to prepare for its celebration. Such committee was appointed; and a call, embracing the important points of the one issued in 1850, was sent out in all directions. The invitation, cordial and earnest, was accepted by large numbers. The committee held a reception in the parlors of the St. James, and a collation was served at seven o'clock P. M.

From the New York Sun. -WHAT THE PAPERS SAID ABOUT THE ST. JAMESRECEPTION.

The parlors of the St. James Hotel were the scene of a delightful reception and reunion of the advocates of woman suffrage on Tuesday afternoon, between the hours of three and five. It was especially a meeting of reminiscences, recalling to many of the pioneers in the woman's cause hours of severe toil and labor, and some bitter experiences, not unmingled with times of rejoicing.

Twenty-two years ago, in 1848, the first meeting for the inauguration of the woman's rights movement was called at Seneca Falls, by 4 Mrs. Lucretia Mott and Mrs. E. Cady Stanton. This was a local meeting, and the first National Convention assembled at Worcester, 1850. The Convention at Worcester, of which yesterday was the second decade celebration, was the real national commencement of the suffrage movement.

Thus the meeting yesterday was one of peculiar interest to the veterans and members of the Association, and all seemed happy in the contemplation of past labors and future triumphs.

Among the large number of distinguished ladies and gentlemen present were noticeable Lucretia Mott, the good, motherly-looking Quakeress, her intellect undimmed by age and toil, as happy and bright as any of her younger associates; Mrs Cady Stanton, Miss Anthony, Mrs Martha C. Wright, sister of Lucretia Mott; Mrs. Joslyn Gage and Miss Julia Gage, of Fayetteville; Mrs Sarah Pugh, Mrs. Lucas sister of John and Jacob Bright, of England, the former of whom advocates the reform movement, and the latter woman suffrage; Mrs Caroline Stratton, of Pennsylvania; Mrs. Bullard, of The Revolution; Mrs. Governor Jewell, of Hartford; Mrs. Elms, of Derby, Conn.; Mrs. Denman, of Quincy, Ill.; Mrs. Lillie Devereux Blake, Mrs. Pauline Wright Davis, one of the Pioneers; Mrs. Dr. Lozier, Mrs. M. Adele Hazlitt, Mrs. Trott, matron of the Girl's Lodging-House of this city, and many others equally well known.

The gentlemen were represented by Theodore Tilton, Edwin A. Studwell, Prof. Wilcox, of Washington University; Mr Packard, of *Packard's Monthly*; the Rev. Henry Powers, of Brooklyn; Alexander Delmar; Mr. Lewis, of the *National Intelligencer*; Col. Hastings, of the late war celebrity, etc.

From The Revolution.

In spite of an earthquake, and a severe gale of wind and rain which passed over our city on Thursday, the reunion in the parlors of the St. James Hotel, on the same afternoon, was complete success. The elements did their worst. The sky wept, and the earth shook, but nothing daunted, the champions of woman's freedom gathered in large numbers, intent upon refreshing their spirits, and renewing their courage by communion with friends and co-workers.

The saintly beauty of Lucretia Mott, which reminds us more of a spirit that has passed beyond the veil, and found rest in the peace of heaven than of aught else, the silvery locks and fair gracious presence of Paulina Davis, the benignity and motherliness of Mrs. Stanton, the earnest, honest face of Susan Anthony, were contrasted with a large number of young workers who have engaged in the good cause at a comparatively recent period, and look up to these matriarchs and pioneers in something of the same spirit that disciples looked up to the prophets of old. Noticeable among the distinguished guests were Mrs. Lucas, sister of John and Jacob Bright, of England; Mrs. Godby, wife of the leading reform advocate of Utah, and Mrs. Gov. Jewell, of Hartford. The occasion was one that will long be remembered with pleasure."

At half-past ten o'clock on Friday morning the convention assembled at Apollo Hall. A large number of the long-trying friends were on the platform and a fine audience in attendance. Mrs. Stanton called the meeting to order and read the call.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE CELEBRATION.

The Twentieth Anniversary of the Inauguration of the Woman Suffrage Movement in this country, will be celebrated in Apollo Hall, in the city of New York, on the 19th and 20th of October, 1870.

The movement on England, as in American, may be dated from the first National Convention, held at Worcester, Mass, October, 1850.

The July following that Convention, a favorable criticism of its proceedings and an able digest of the whole question appeared in the Westminster Review, written by Mrs. John Stuart Mill, which awakened attention in both hemispheres. In the call for that convention, the following subjects for discussion were presented: Woman's right to Education, *Literary, Scientific and Artistic*;— Her Avocations, *Industrial, Commercial and Professional*;— Her Interest, *Pecuniary, Civil and Political*: in a word, Her Rights as an *Individual*, and her Functions as a *Citizen*.

It is hoped that the Old and the New World will both be largely represented by the earlier advocates of this reform, who will bring with them reports of progress and plans for future action. An extensive foreign correspondence will also add interest to the meetings. We specially invite the presence of those just awakening to an interest in this great movement, that from a knowledge of the past they may draw fresh inspiration for the work of the future and fraternize with a generation now rapidly passing away.

As those who inaugurated a reform, so momentous and far reaching in its consequence, held themselves above all party considerations and personal antagonisms, and as this gathering is to be in no way connected with either of our leading Woman Suffrage organizations, we hope that the friends of real progress everywhere will come together and unitedly celebrate this twentieth anniversary of a great national movement for freedom.

Committee of Arrangements. — Lucretia Mott, Sarah Pugh, Elizabeth C. Stanton, Ernestine L. Rose, Samuel J. May, C. L. H. Nichols.

On behalf of the Committee, PAULINA W. DAVIS, *Chairman*.

Mrs. Stanton then said that after due consultation the committee had decided that as (Mrs. Davis had called the first National Convention twenty years ago) and presided over its deliberations, it was

peculiarly fitting that she should preside over this also. A motion was made and seconded to that effect, and unanimously adopted.

On taking the chair, Mrs. Davis gave the following history:

THE HISTORY OF THE WOMAN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT, READ IN THE MEETING HELD IN APOLLO HALL, NEW YORK, OCT. 21, 1870.

In assembling as we have done to review the past twenty years, it is a fitting question to ask if there has been progress; or has this universal radical reform, which was then declared, been like reformations in religion, but a substitution of a new error for an old one; or, like physical revolutions, but a rebellion?

Has this work, intended from its inception to change the structure of the central organization of society, failed and become a monument of buried hopes? Have we come together after twenty years, bowed with a profound grief over the wrecks and debris of the battle unwon, or to rejoice over what has been attained and mark out work for the next decade?

We answer, in many things we have failed, for we believed and hoped beyond the possible; but in reviewing the past we have only cause for rejoicing—for thanksgiving to God—and for courage in the future.

In the beginning it was natural that minds devoted for years to the work in hand should undertake the array of the required forces and the definite direction of the effort for the future; and now, it is equally proper that we call young, fresh workers, to receive from our hands the sacred cause.

We affirmed a principle, an adjustment of measures to the exigencies of the times, a profound expediency true to the highest principles of rights, and to-day we reiterate the axiom with which we started, that "They who would be free themselves must strike the blow," believing it as imperative as when the first woman took it up, and 7 applied it to her needs; and it must be kept as steadily before the eye, for not yet can we rest on our oars and play with the privileges gained.

Women are still frivolous; the slaves of prejudice, passion, folly, fashion and petty ambitions, and so they will remain till the shackles, both social and political, are broken, and they are held responsible beings—accountable to God alone for their lives. Not till then can it be known what untold wealth lies buried in womanhood—"how many mute, inglorious Miltons."

Me are still conceited, arrogant and usurping, dwarfing their own manhood by a false position toward one-half the human race.

In commencing this work we knew that we were attacking the strongholds of prejudice, but truth could no longer be suppressed, nor principles hidden. It must be ours strike the bottom line. We believed it would take a generation to clear away the rubbish, to uproot the theories of ages, to overflow customs, which at some period of the world's history had their significance. We knew that in attacking these stronghold we should bring ridicule and opposition, but having counted the cost, and put our hand to the plow, we would not turn back.

We proclaimed that our work was to reform, reconstruct and harmonize society; not to lay waste her homes and her sanctuaries.

We did not promise that we would not probe to the core if we found ulcers eating into the very vitals of our social or political organizations. A few only have been found brave enough to do more than touch the fringe-work that circles round the vortex which is heaving and surging with social polutions, which might well make angels stand appalled; but should the occasion come in this country, the pure women of our nation will rise, as the women of England are now doing, resisting a legislation which degrades womanhood to the lowest depths.

We proclaimed a peaceful revolution; for we abhorred then as now the horrors of war, hence our demand for a participation in government, that we might bring a new element into it to restrain and purify it.

Says a French lady in a private letter received a few days since, "Oh, is it not time that women come? Is it not because *we* have no voice in public affairs that Europe is on fire now? Men are true brutes. Pride, injustice and cruelty are their most remarkable qualities. What can free us from their laws so unjust?"

This is the sad, passionate utterance of a French woman now in the hour of her country's peril. What better proof that women love peace more than glory, than in the Empress Eugenie's course! She would have no force used to uphold her power. "She would rather be pitied than hated."

8

Having laid the foundations broad we have steadily demanded equality in all relations, all rights and immunities, all duties as citizens, never asking favors because we are women, but even-handed justice and the ballot; without which we know that rights, if conceded, are held by an insecure tenure.

Two years previous to the issue of the call of 1850, there had been three conventions held, one in Seneca Falls, one in Rochester, N. Y., and one in Ohio. In the very first Convention Mrs. E. C. Stanton offered the following resolution:

"Resolved, That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves the elective franchise." This special resolution called forth more ridicule than any or all of the other action of the meeting.

This convention was presided over by James Mott, of Philadelphia, a man in whose pure soul there was no guile, no shadow of fear, no faltering or failure of principle; truthful, just, generous and loving, he rests from his labors and his good deeds are graven on loving, grateful hearts.

The Ohio convention had some peculiar characteristics; it was held in the Friend's Meeting-House in Salem. It was officered entirely by women; not a man was allowed to sit on the platform, to speak or vote. *Never did men so suffer.* They implored just to say a word; but no, the President was inflexible—no man should be heard. If one meekly rose to make a suggestion he was at once ruled out of order. For the first time in the world's history men learned how it felt to sit in silence when great questions were pending. It would have been an admirable closing, if a rich banquet had been provided to which the men should have had the *privilege* of purchasing tickets to the gallery, there to enjoy the savory odors and listen to the after-dinner speeches. A little pity, mingled with justice, prevented this *finale*. And at the close, after the adjournment, the men organized and indorsed all the women had said and done.

The following are some of the resolutions:

"Resolved, That the evils arising from the present social, civil and religious condition of women proclaim to them, in language not to be misunderstood, that not only their own welfare, but the highest good of the race, demands of them as an imperative duty, that they should secure to themselves the Elective Franchise.

"Resolved, That the prohibiting of woman from participating in the enactment of laws by which she is governed is a direct violation of the first principles of nature."

From this convention an able memorial, written by Mrs. Mary A. W. Johnson, was sent to the Ohio Constitutional Convention. I give the closing sentence:

"We earnestly request that in the new constitution you are about to form for the State of Ohio, women shall be secured, not only the right of suffrage but all the political and legal rights which are guaranteed to men." This memorial was, we believe, the first ever presented by women to any Legislative body in this country.

It was not long before it was felt that this reform was working its way into the current legislation even of Ohio, where the old barbarous common law had heretofore been the code for woman.

An address—calm, earnest and logical—was presented to this convention, by Mrs. Jane Elizabeth Jones, which was published and extensively circulated.

Were I to go back of these conventions, to see what had roused women thus to do and dare, I should be obliged to go into a long history of the despotism of repression, which German jurists call "soul murder;" an unwritten code, universal and cruel as the laws of Draco, and so subtle that, entering everywhere, they weigh most heavily where least seen. By nature, women are conservative, and hold steadily to principle; faith is inborn, not grafted on; hence there must have been deep-seated causes to drive them out of that quiet interior life so pleasantly pictured by reverend divines of modern times. We must turn to the discussions in the churches as to the right and propriety of their speaking and praying in public. The controversy there waxed hot, churches were divided, presbyteries were disturbed, Paul and Christ were made to appear antagonistic, and women must choose between the freedom which Christ gave to all, or accept the false interpretation of priestly arrogance. A few chose to be their own expounders of the Word and hold their consciences toward God void of offence.

In 1828, Frances Wright, a noble Englishwoman, commenced lecturing. She had earnestly sought to make herself thoroughly acquainted with the nature of our institutions, and the genius of our government. She determined to try the experiment of organized labor with negroes. Purchasing two thousand acres of land on the Bluffs, now known as Memphis, Tenn., she took a number of families, with fifteen able-bodied men, and, giving them their freedom, organized her work. Prostrated by illness she was compelled to yield her personal supervision, and thus her attempt to civilize those people failed, and they were finally sent to Hayti.

She then commenced lecturing on the nature and object of "American Political Institutions." She gave also a course of Historical Political Lectures; and another course on the Nature of Knowledge, Free Inquiry, Divisions of Knowledge, Religion, Morals, Opinions, Existing 10 Evils and a Reply to the Traducers of the French Reformers. No other person was at that time prepared so well to defend the French Reformers as she was, from her having been in part educated in General Lafayette's family. In all those lectures she showed the low estimate of woman, and her inferior education.

To this heroic woman, who left ease, elegance, a high social circle of rich culture, and with true self-abnegation, gave her life, in the country of her adoption, to the teaching of her highest idea of truth, it is fitting that we pay a tribute of just, though late, respect. Her writings are of the purest and noblest character, and whatever there is of error in them is easily thrown aside.

The spider sucks poison from the same flower from which the bee gathers honey; let us therefore ask if the evil be not in ourselves before we condemn others.

This brave, unselfish, noble woman, did not pass unscathed through her ordeal. Phariseeism, then as now, was ready to stone the prophet of freedom. She bore the calumny, reproach and persecution to which she was subjected for the truth, as calmly as Socrates. Looking down from was serene heights of her philosophy she pitied and endured the scoffs and jeers of the multitude, and fearlessly continued to utter her rebukes against oppression, ignorance and bigotry. Women joined in the hue and cry against her, little thinking that men were building the gallows and making them the executioners. Women have crucified in all ages the redeemers of their own sex; and men mock them with the fact. It is time now that we trample beneath our feet this ignoble public sentiment which men have made for us; and if others are to be crucified before we can be redeemed, let men do the cruel, cowardly act; but let us learn to hedge womanhood round with generous, protecting care and love. Then men will learn, as they should, that this system of traducing women is no longer to be used as a means of their subjugation: it has been the most potent weapon to work on the minds of women.

Let them learn to demand that all men who come into their presence be as pure as they claim that woman should be. Let the test be applied which Christ gave, that if any is without sin in word, or deed, or thought, he shall "cast the first stone."

In 1836, Mrs. Ernestine L. Rose, a beautiful and highly cultivated Polish lady, began lecturing in this country on the "Science of Government," "Political Economy," and the "Equal Rights of Women." She also, in the same year, sent to the Legislature of New York a petition with five names (which had cost her weary miles of walking, and 11 hours of talking), asking for the property rights of women. * Where-ever she announced her lectures they were the subject of ridicule. The audacity of a woman attempting to treat such subjects astonished men and excited curiosity. They went to hear and, if not convinced, they admired her clear, strong intellect, respected her logic, and many were her enthusiastic converts.

* The same year another lady, from the central part of the State, without concert of action, sent a petition of similar import with thirty names. Neither of these petitions made much impression or received much attention.

In 1837, Mary S. Gove commenced lecturing on "Woman's Rights," especially her right to a thorough medical professional course. Her lectures were productive of untold good to women, wakening them to a desire for health and mental culture, and to higher conceptions of motherhood.

The same year came Sarah and Angelina Grimke, from Charleston, South Carolina. Having emancipated their slaves, they were prepared to run the parallel between the slave code and those laws made expressly for women.

In 1839, a National Woman's Anti-Slavery Convention was called in Philadelphia. In this these sisters took an active part, and Angelina was appointed to prepare an appeal for the slaves. Thus the first National Woman's Convention, may be said to have inaugurated the national work of women.

In this convention Abby Kelley first became known. Her eloquence, together with that of Angelina Grimke, so excited the curiosity and interest of men, that they insisted upon coming in to hear, and thus, without premeditation, they found themselves speaking to promiscuous audiences. This Abby Kelley continued for years, and in 1840 the Anti-Slavery Society, which boasted the only free platform the world had ever known, was rent in twain, because her friends placed her name on a committee, and demanded the right of woman to speak and vote.

In this conflict for principle, the names of Wm. L. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Edmund Quincy, Oliver Johnson, Parker Pillsbury and S. S. Foster stand out conspicuously, and will so be remembered in all the future. The resolution was carried by one hundred majority.

About this time a World's Anti-slavery Convention was called in London. A number of women were sent by their respective societies as delegates.

After going three thousand miles, regularly accredited; their hearts bleeding for the wrongs of the slave and burning with love of freedom; they found that they were only women; and had no rights there. A furious discussion ensued. The vexed question came in the persons of 12 Lucretia Mott, Sarah Pugh, Ann G. Phillips and others; all alike refused their seats. Wendell Phillips, Daniel O'Connell, Dr. Bowring, George Thompson, H. B. Stanton and others, stood bravely by oppressed womanhood. The discussion was in presence of our American delegates, and such women as Harriet Martineau, Mary Howitt, Lady Noel Byron, Elizabeth Fry, Mrs. Jameson and many others. William Lloyd Garrison not arriving till the third day of the convention declined taking his seat on this account. This holocaust to prejudice, served rather to hasten than hinder the uprising of womanhood for freedom.

In 1843, John Neal, of Portland, Maine, gave a lecture in New York which roused considerable discussion; it was replied to by Mrs. Eliza W. Farnham, with all the objections which have ever been urged, and far more ably than by any of the later objectors. Mrs. Farnham lived long enough to retrace her ground and accept the highest truth. "Woman and her Era" fully refutes her early objections.

Mr. Neal's lecture, published in *The Brother Jonathan*, was extensively copied, and as it reviewed some of the laws relating to woman and her property it had a wide, silent influence, preparing the way for action. It was a scathing satire, and men felt the rebuke.

From 1841 to 1843, Mrs. Lydia Maria Child edited the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, published in New York. The very great ability which Mrs. Child showed in managing this paper marked an era for woman and introduced her to that field of labor which is now occupied by so many. Her steady, brave, persistent demand for freedom for the slave, for his enfranchisement and for his social rights, has done much for woman.

Margaret Fuller's "Woman in the Nineteenth Century," appeared in 1845. This marked another period in the progress of thought. She demanded that every avenue to equal education and industrial pursuits be open to women, and, above all, she demanded that women be free to give the law in all social and marital relations.

About this period Mrs. Frances D. Gage also began writing for Western papers, sowing seed which is bearing now an abundant harvest. Later she became an able and efficient lecturer, North, South, East and West, and to her we owe an affectionate tribute, now when she is withheld by illness from work, waiting in a peaceful spirit the call to go Home.

In May, 1850, a few women in Boston, attending the Anti-Slavery meeting, proposed that all who felt interested in a plan for a National Woman's Rights Convention should consult in the ante-room. Out of the nine who went out into that dingy, dark room, a committee of seven were chosen to do the work. Worcester was the place selected, 13 and the 18th and 19th of October the time appointed. The work soon devolved upon one person. Illness hindered one, duty to a brother another, duty to the slave a third, professional engagements a fourth, the fear of bringing the gray hairs of a father to the grave prevented another serving; and thus the work was left to one, but the pledge was made and could not be withdrawn.

The call was prepared, an argument in itself, and sent forth with earnest private letters in all directions. This call covered the entire question, as it now stands before the public.

Woman's Rights to Education—Literary, Scientific and Artistic : her Avocations—Industrial, Commercial and Professional; her Interests—Pecuniary, Civil and Political : in a WORD, her rights as an Individual, and her Functions as a Citizen.

This call, though moderate in tone, carefully guarding the idea of the absolute unity of interests and of the destiny of the two sexes which nature has established, still gave the alarm to conservatism.

Letters, curt, reproachful and sometimes almost insulting, came with absolute refusals to have the names of the writers used or added to the swelling list already in hand. There was astonishment at the temerity of the writer in presenting such a request.

Some few there were, so cheering and so excellent that it is but justice to give extracts from them.

"I doubt whether a more important movement has ever been launched, touching the destiny of the race, than this in regard to the equality of the sexes. You are at liberty to use my name"

William Lloyd Garrison."

"The new movement has my fullest sympathy, and my name is at its service.

Catherine M. Sedgwick."

"The new movement has my fullest sympathy, and my name is at its service.

"William Henry Channing."

None came with such perfect and entire fullness as the one from which I quote the closing paragraph: "Yes, with all my heart I give my name to your noble call.

"Elizabeth Cady Stanton."

"You are at liberty to append my own and my wife's name to your admirable call.

"Ann Green Phillips, Wendell Phillips."

Rev. Samuel J. May's letter, full of the warmest sympathy, well deserves to be quoted entire, but space forbids; suffice it that we have always known just where to find him.

"Your *business* is to launch new ideas—not one of them will ever be wrecked or lost. Under the dominion of these ideas, right practice must gradually take the place of wrong, and the first we shall know we shall find the social swallowing up the political, and the whole governing its parts. With genuine respect your co-worker.

"Mrs. Paulina W. Davis. Elizur Wright."

Letters from Gerrit Smith, Joshua R. Giddings, John G. Whittier, Ralph Waldo Emerson, A. Bronson Alcott, Caroline Kirkland," Ann Estelle Lewis, J. G. Swisshelm, William Elder, Rev. Thomas Brainard, and many others, expressive of deep interest, are before us, but space forbids extracts.

The convention came together on the bright October days, a solemn, earnest crown of workers.

One great disappointment fell upon us. Margaret Fuller, toward whom many eyes were turned as the future leader in this movement, was not with us. The "hungry, ravening sea," had swallowed her up, and we were left to mourn her guiding hand—her royal presence. To her, I, at least, had hoped to confide the leadership of this movement. It can never be known if she would have accepted this leadership: the desire had been expressed to her by letter; but be that as it may, she was, and still is, a leader of thought—a position far more desirable than of numbers.

The convention was called to order by Mrs. Sarah Earl, or Worcester, and a permanent list of officers presented in due order, and the whole business of the convention was conducted in a Parliamentary manner.

Mrs. Earl, to whose memory we pay tribute to-day as one gone before, not lost, was one of the loveliest embodiments of womanhood I have ever known. She possessed a rare combination of strength, gentleness and earnestness, with a childlike freedom and cheerfulness. I miss to-day her clear voice, her graceful self poise, her calm dignity.

From our midst another is missing: Mrs. Sarah Tyndale, of Philadelphia—one of the first to sign the call. Indeed, the idea of such a convention had often been discussed in her home, more than two years before, a home where every progressive thought found a cordial welcome. To this noble woman, who gave herself to this work with genuine earnestness, it is fitting that we pay a tribute of affectionate respect. She was, perhaps, more widely known than any other woman of her time for her practical talents: having conducted one of the largest business houses in her native city for nearly a quarter of a century.

Genial and largely hospitable, there was for her great social sacrifice in taking up a cause so unpopular; but she had no shrinking from duty, however trying it might be. Strong and grand as she was, in her womanly nature, she had nevertheless the largest and tenderest sympathies for the weak and erring. She was prescient, philosophical, just and generous. The mother of a large family, who gathered around to honor and bless her, she had still room in her heart for the woes of the world, and the latter years of her life were given to earnest, philanthropic work. We miss to-day her sympathy, her wise counsel, her great, organizing power.

Many others there are, whose names well deserve to be graven in gold, and it is cause of thanksgiving to God that they are still present with us, their lives speaking better than words.

Some are in the far West, doing brave service there others, are across the water; others are withheld by cares and duties from being present; but we would fain hope none are absent from choice.

Profound feeling pervaded the entire audience, and the talent displayed in the discussions, the eloquence of women who had never before spoken in public, surprised even those who expected most. Mrs. C. I. H. Nichols, of Vermont, made a profound impression. There was a touching, tender pathos in her stories which went home to the heart; and many eyes, all unused to tears, were moistened as she described the agony of the mother robbed of her child by the law.

Abby H. Price, large hearted, and large brained, gentle and strong, presented an address on the social question not easily forgotten, and seldom to the present time bettered.

Lucy Stone, a natural orator, with a silvery voice and a heart warm with enthusiasm, and Antoinette Brown, a young minister, met firmly the scriptural arguments, and Harriot K. Hunt, earnest for the education of woman, gave variety to the discussions and deliberation of the meeting.

In this first national meeting, the following resolution was passed, which it may be proper here to reiterate, thus showing that our present demand has always been one and the same:

"Resolved, That women are clearly entitled to the right of suffrage, and to be considered eligible to office; the omission to demand which, on her part, is a palpable recreancy to duty, and a denial of which is a gross usurpation on the part of man, no longer to be endured; and that every party which claims to represent the humanity, civilization and progress of the age, is bound to inscribe on its banners, 'Equality before the Law, Without Distinction of Sex or Color.'"

From North to South the press found these earnest workers wonderfully ridiculous people. The "hen convention," was served up in every variety of style, till refined women dreaded to look into a newspaper. Hitherto man had assumed to be the conscience of woman, now she indicated the will to think for herself; hence all this odium. But however the word was preached, whether for wrath or conscience sake, we rejoiced and thanked God.

In July following this convention, an able and elaborate notice appeared in the "Westminster Review." This notice, candid in tone and spirit, as it was thorough and able in discussion, successfully vindicated every position we assumed, reaffirmed and established the highest ground taken in principle or policy by our movement.

The wide-spread circulation and high authority of this paper told upon the public mind, both in Europe and this country. It was at the time supposed to be Mr. John Stuart Mill. Later we learned that it was from the pen of his noble wife, to whom be all honor for thus coming to the aid of a struggling cause.

I can pay no tribute to her memory so beautiful as the following extract from a letter recently received from her husband:

"It gives me the greatest pleasure to know that the service rendered by my dear wife to the cause which was nearer her heart than any other, by her essay in the Westminster Review, has had so much effect and is so justly appreciated in the United States. Were it possible in a memoir to have the formation and growth of a mind like hers portrayed, to do so would be as valuable a benefit to mankind as was ever conferred by a biography. But such a psychological history is seldom possible, and in her case the materials for it do not exist. All that could be furnished is her birth-place, parentage and a few dates, and it seems to me that her memory is more honored by the absence of any attempt at a biographical notice than by the presence of a most meagre one. What she was, I have attempted, though most inadequately, to delineate in the remarks prefaced to her essay, as reprinted with my 'Disertations and Discussions.'

"I am very glad to hear of the step in advance made by the Rhode Island Legislature in constituting a Board of Women for some important administrative purposes. Your intended proposal, that women be impaneled on every jury where women are to be tried seems to me very good, and calculated to place the injustice to which women are at present subjected, by the entire legal system, in a very striking light.

"I am, dear madam, "Yours sincerely, "Mrs. P. W. Davis J. S. Mill."

About this period Elizabeth Oakes Smith, with her graceful pen and fertile genius, came to the aid of our cause by defending the convention and the movers of it, through the columns of the Tribune, and afterward published a series of essays entitled "Woman and her Needs."

Immediately after the reports were published, they were sent to various persons in Europe; and before the next convention, letters of cheer were received from Harriet Martineau and Mrs. Marion Reid, author of a work of education. From the French Prison, where Pauline Roland and Jeanne Deroine were incarcerated for their out-spoken love of freedom, came the following letter which is so prophetic of the present that it will not be less interesting to-day than when received in 1851. The letter was read by Rev. Wm. H. Channing, and was followed by a very powerful argument on the political rights of woman:

"To the Convention of the Women of America:

"Dear Sisters —Your courageous declaration of Woman's Rights has resounded, even to our prison, and has filled our souls with inexpressible joy.

"In France the reaction has suppressed the cry of liberty of the women of the future. Deprived, like their brothers of the Democracy, of the right to civil and political equality; and the fiscal laws which trammel the liberty of the press, hinder the propagation of these eternal truths which must regenerate humanity.

"They wish, the woman of France, to found a hospitable tribunal, which shall receive the cry of the oppressed and suffering, and vindicate in the name of humanity, solidarity, the social rights for both sexes equally, and where woman, the mother of humanity, may claim in the name of her children, mutilated by tyranny, her right to true liberty, to the complete development and free exercise of all her faculties, and reveal that HALF of TRUTH which *is in her*, and without which no social work can be complete.

The darkness of reaction has obscured the sun of 1848, which seemed to rise so radiantly. Why? Because the revolutionary tempest, in overturning at the same time the throne and the scaffold, in breaking the chain of the black slave, forgot to break the chain of the most oppressed of all of the pariahs of humanity.

"There shall be no more slaves,' said our brethren. We proclaim universal suffrage. All shall have the right to elect the agents who shall carry out the constitution which should be based on the principles

of liberty equality and fraternity. Let each one come and deposit his vote; the barrier of privilege is overturned; before the electoral urn there are no more oppressed, no more masters and slaves.

"Woman in listening to this appeal, rises, and approaches the liberating urn, to exercise her right of suffrage as a member of society. But the barrier of privilege rises also before her. 'You must *wait*,' they say! But by this claim alone woman affirms the right, not yet recognized, of the half of humanity—the right of woman to Liberty, equality and fraternity. She obliges man to verify the fatal attack which he makes on the integrity of his principles.

"Soon—in fact, during the wonderful days of June, 1848—liberty glides for her pedestal in the flood of the victims of the reaction—based on the right of the strongest, she falls, overturned in the name of 'the right of the strongest.'

"The assembly kept silence in regard to the right of one-half of humanity, for which only one of its members raised his voice, but in vain. No mention was made of the right of woman, in a constitution framed in the name of liberty, equality and fraternity.

18

"It is in the name of these principles that woman comes to claim her right to take part in the legislative assembly, and to help to form the laws which must govern society, of which she is a member.

"She comes to demand of the electors the consecration of the principle of equality by the election of a woman, and by this act she obliges man to prove that the fundamental law which he has formed in the sole name of liberty, equality and fraternity, is still based upon privilege, and soon privilege triumphs over this phantom of universal suffrage, which, being but half of itself, sinks on the 31st of May, 1850.

"But while those selected by the half of the people—by men alone—evoke force to stifle liberty, and forge restrictive laws to establish order by compression, woman, guided by fraternity, foreseeing incessant struggles, and in the hope of putting an end to them, makes an appeal to the laborer to found liberty and equality on fraternal solidarity. The participation of woman gave to this work of enfranchisement an eminently pacific character, and the laborer recognizes the right of woman, his companion in labor.

"The delegates of a hundred and four associations, united, without distinction of sex, elected two women, with several of their brethren, to participate equally with them in the administration of the interests of labor, and in the organization of the work of solidarity.

"Fraternal associations were formed with the object of enfranchising the laborer from the yoke of spoliation and patronage, but, isolated in the midst of the Old World, their efforts could only produce a feeble amelioration for themselves.

"The union of associations based on fraternal solidarity had for its end the organization of labor, that is to say, an equal division of labor, of instruments, and of the products of labor.

"The means were, the union of labor, and of credit among the workers of all professions, in order to acquire the instruments of labor, and the necessary materials, and to form a mutual guarantee for the education of their children, and to provide for the needs of the old, the sick and the infirm.

"In this organization all the workers, without distinction of sex or profession, having an equal right to election, and being eligible for all functions, and all having equally the initiative and the sovereign decision in the acts of common interests, they laid the foundation of a new society based on liberty, equality and fraternity.

"It is in the name of law framed by man only—by those elected by privilege—that the Old World, wishing to stifle in the germ the holy work of pacific enfranchisement, has shut up within the walls of a prison those who had founded it—those elected by the laborers.

"But the impulse has been given, a grand act has been accomplished. The right of woman has been recognized by the laborers, and they have consecrated that right by the election of those who had claimed it in vain for both sexes, before the electoral urn and before the electoral committees. They have received the true civil baptism, were elected by the laborers to accomplish the mission of enfranchisement, and after having shared their rights and their duties, they share to-day their captivity.

"It is from the depths of their prison that they address to you the relation of these facts, which contain in themselves high instruction. It is by *labor*, it is by entering resolutely into the *ranks* of the *working people*, that *women will conquer the civil and political equality on which depends the happiness of the world*. As to moral equality, has she not conquered it by the power of sentiment? It is, therefore, by the sentiment of the love of humanity that the mother of humanity will find power to accomplish her high mission. It is when she shall have well comprehended the *holy law of solidarity*—which is not an obscure and mysterious dogma, but a living providential fact—that the kingdom of God promised by Jesus, and which is no other than the kingdom of equality and justice, shall be realized on earth.

"Sisters of America! your socialist sisters of France are united with you in the vindication of the right of woman to civil and political equality. We have, moreover, the profound conviction that only by the power of association based on solidarity—by the union 19 of the working classes of both sexes to organize labor—can be acquired, completely and pacifically, the civil and political equality of woman, and the social right for all.

"It is in this confidence that, from the depths of the jail which still imprisons our bodies without reaching our hearts, we cry to you— *Faith, Love, Hope*, and send to you our sisterly salutations.

(Signed), Jeanne Deroine, Pauline Roland.

" Paris, Prison of St. Lagare, June 15, 1851."

What then was left to us, but to go on with a work which had challenged the understanding and constrained the hearts of the best and soundest thinkers in the nation; had given an impulse to the women of England and of Sweden—for Frederika Bremer had quoted from our writings and reported our proceedings; our words had been like an angel's visit to the prisoners of state in France and to the wronged and outraged at home?

Many letters were received from literary women in this country as well as abroad. If not always ready to be identified with the work, they were appreciative of its good effects, and like Nicodemus they came by night to inquire "how these things could be."

Self interest showed them the advantages accruing from the recognition of equality—self-ism held them silent before the world till the reproach should be worn away; but we credit them with a sense of justice and right, which prompts them *now* to action. The rear guard is as essential in the army as the advance; each should select the place best adapted to their own powers.

In the second convention, held in the same place (October 1851), Elizabeth Oakes Smith came forward, and honored herself by her fearless advocacy of the truth, and by her graceful eloquence made many new friends to the cause.

She made her way into the lyceums and some pulpits never before open to woman.

In this convention Mrs. Ernestine L. Rose made an address of an hour in length, which has never been surpassed. She printed it at her own expense, and circulated it extensively. It is embodied in the report of that meeting, as also Wendell Phillips' speech, and the able report on industrial avocations and one on education presented by the president.

At the close of Mrs. Rose's speech, Mrs. Emma R. Coe, of Ohio, spoke on the legal disabilities of woman. She reviewed in a strain of pungent irony, the laws of several of the States in relation to woman, showing them to be unjust and oppressive, and prejudicial to the best and highest interests of the whole community. She was a fluent, earnest speaker, and held a strong, magnetic power over her audience.

The third National Convention was held in Syracuse, New York, 20 October 1852. Here there was more enthusiasm if less order. New friends came into the work. Matilda J. Gage first appeared in this meeting, and from that time she has been a most true, tried and trusted friend of this cause.

Here Susan B. Anthony made her *debut* as an advocate of this cause, and from that day to the present she has been "instant in season and out of season," doing hard work, which no one, not wholly consecrated to it, could do.

During the winter following, she visited every county in the State, lecturing and circulating petitions for the amendment of the laws of the State of New York; and to her efforts, combined with Mrs. Stanton's, may be attributed the favorable changes of the laws in relation to woman's right to her property and her right to her children.

At the convention in Syracuse the idea of a paper was started, and a proposition made for a joint stock company; but the poverty of women, as usual, caused the failure of that scheme. Fifty subscribers were obtained, and a pledge given that a paper should be forthcoming the first of January, and thus the UNA, the first Woman's Rights paper owned, edited and published by a woman, was sent out January 1st, 1853. An unexpected difficulty met the editor. Few writers had sufficient consecration to contribute to the paper without pay. The circulation was not sufficiently large to give fame, and the bank of the editor could not furnish the needed inducement; thus the editor's labors were made so arduous in writing over various signatures, in order to give variety, that in two years her health became seriously impaired. This paper was published two years in Providence, Rhode Island, and the, passing into other hands, it was removed to Boston, where, after ten months, it expired from inanition. Thus failed a hope and an agency which should have been the *pride* of women.

The fourth National Convention came to the city of New York. It was held the same week of the World's Temperance Convention, from which some of our earliest workers were excluded.

Rev. Antoinette Brown, a delegate from her church and temperance society, was not permitted a seat in this convention. Again the vexed question of the woman! Again a division on the right and justice, or rather the injustice, toward her! A mob, inaugurated in the temperance hall, culminated in

the Woman's Convention at the Tabernacle. The meeting was not entirely broken up but disturbed and annoyed by hissing serpents, and stamping, noisy animals.

About this time new workers came to our aid: George W. Curtis, Henry Ward Beecher and T. W. Higginson. The argument made some time after this before the New York Legislature, by G. W. Curtis, 21 has been, and still is, one of the best means of convicting and converting sinners that we have in hand.

The next Convention held in Cleveland was one of interest, and was marked by very spirited resolutions. So also those in Cincinnati and Philadelphia; but our volumes of the UNA, containing the proceedings of these meetings, are lost, likewise of State Convention, held in Rochester, Saratoga, Indiana, Illinois and many other places.

The data is wanting to make our chain complete. In 1852 a meeting was held in Westchester, Pennsylvania. Called simply as a State Convention, it was nevertheless attended by many persons from a distance, and the Parliamentary report put forth would be a credit to any deliberative assembly.

In 1855 a Convention was held in Boston, at which Ralph Waldo Emerson spoke in his most felicitous style. E. Oakes Smith presented a poem, Wendell Phillips surpassed himself, Theodore Parker, Dr. Mercy B. Jackson and Mrs. Caroline M. Severance did admirable service. In this convention able reports, or a digest of the laws of the New England States, were presented. That of Massachusetts was a full and able exposition of woman's disabilities, by Mrs. Caroline H. Dall. The one from New Hampshire was a concise report by Ellen M. Tarr. The one from Rhode Island was prepared, in part, by Dunbar Harris, and presented by P. W. Davis. This convention was strictly a New England gathering, and hence does not properly belong to the history of the national work. State Conventions and State work are State history.

About this time, Mrs. E. C. Stanton, S. B. Anthony and C. H. Dall were often heard in the legislatures of New York and Massachusetts; also in Ohio, Mrs. F.D. Gage urged a juster legislation for woman.

In 1855, Lucy Stone made her protest against the marriage laws, as they exist on our statute books. Lucy Stone and Henry Blackwell put forth their pronunciamiento—they were individuals—the woman was not “extinguished” by the ceremony; she held her property and her own name as before, and the children were to bear the names of both parents.

Conventions multiplied, and the discussion of principle became more general. Laws were amended, and a wider range of thought was apparent on all sides. Societies were organized, and the question

was emerging from the ridicule which had enveloped it, when the war came, and women of the highest order of patriotism and earnestness entered their country's service, breaking down prejudice in the hospital and on the battle-field, doing a work which should forever close the mouths of all opponents to woman's suffrage, on the ground that the franchise makes her liable to military duty, for which she is incompetent. It was 22 fully demonstrated that without the practical talents of women the Sanitary Commission would have failed, and our hospitals been sorry places for our wounded, dying men.

When the war ended and national reconstruction commenced then women, feeling an equal interest in having the work rightly done, came forward with their petitions to be remembered, and were coolly told by the men who were most eager to enfranchise the negro man, to "stand aside and wait, it was the black man's hour." The sacrifice of their sons on the altar of freedom was not counted to them as anything. Their years of toil and weary watching in camp and hospital were not to be put in the scale with the *black man's*, who fought for his own freedom. Such wrong and injustice is bearing its fruits, in the confusion of the councils of the Republican party. Like the French of 1848, they refused to deal justly with the mothers of the nation, and are now reaping a bitter reward. They dared to suppress the petitions of thousands of women, and now disintegration is felt to have begun; the handwriting is seen on the wall. Thus wrong and injustice has done its work, and thousands of women have been roused by it to protest who had never before taken any part in this work.

The ninth National Convention, held in the Church of the Puritans, the first after the war ended, was one of intense interest, and marked an era in this movement. The demand for suffrage became the paramount demand—the only with many.

Mrs. Stanton, in 1867, went before the Judiciary Committee of the New York Legislature, asking universal suffrage to be recognized by the Constitutional Convention which was to be held. About this time a bill was before a Committee of the Legislature, the purport of which was to legalize prostitution. Reading this bill in presence of the Committee, her quick mind comprehended all its horrors at a glance, and she tried the test of asking each man if he would be willing that law should be applied to his daughter, his sister, or any one dear to him. Self-ism answered "No." "Then, sir, you have no right to legislate for another as you would not for yourself," said the brave woman. All that winter she battled against that hideous system, which would legalize the foulest of sins, and to her efforts mainly, the delay of passing that law is due. She made a clear exposition of that cruel, corrupt, one-sided legislation, which subjects woman to the grossest indignities, while men are benefited and allowed safe and unlimited license.

To her lectures, also, is due a healthier tone of public sentiment on the marriage question. It is slowly beginning to be felt that in that relation there is a vast amount of legalized prostitution, bearing the semblance of virtue, which is rotten below the fair exterior.

? It was held in 1859

23

In 1868 the women of Vineland, New Jersey, went in large numbers to the polls, ballot in hand, were received courteously, although told that their votes would not be counted. They were photographed, as they stood before the polls, and their ballots were placed in the archives of their historical society.

In 1870 they again went to the polls, in still larger numbers. It is fitting that New Jersey women should lead in this, as through their want to "vigilance, the price of freedom," the right was legislated away from them. As this act is clearly unconstitutional, it is to be hoped that it will be set aside very soon by the more enlightened legislators of to-day.

In 1867 an extensive lecturing tour through Kansas was made by Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony, Rev. Olympia Brown, Henry Blackwell and Lucy Stone. The proposition of striking the words "white male" from the Constitution had been submitted to the people, and the result of the campaign was one-third the vote of the State in favor of both propositions. Of Miss Brown, now preaching in New England, we cannot forbear saying we have few in our ranks more earnest, honest or devoted. A clear, incisive intellect, a true heart and firm purpose mark her every-day life. She is unobtrusive and gentle, but always ready at the call of duty.

On this campaign they were joined by a new worker, George Francis Train, whether for good or ill it will be for history to decide. Certain it is, that a new impulse was given to the cause, and the Revolution established, with S. B. Anthony as proprietor, E. C. Stanton and Parker Pillsbury as editors, has done a great work. It has been hated, abused, slandered, misquoted and garbled; nevertheless, it has been a terror to evil doers, and a help to those who would do well.

Others, thinking to do better, have started monthly and weekly papers. The Woman's Advocate was published one year. The Ohio Woman's Advocate and the Agitator were merged in the Woman's Journal, of Boston, which, with an able corps of editors, is in the field. Also, the Pioneer in California, edited by Mrs. Emily Stevens; Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly, New York, and The New World, edited by P. W. Davis and Kate Stanton, R. I. Other papers there are which devote large space to the subject, but not edited by women.

In May, 1869, at the annual meeting of the Equal Rights Society, which had been tree years in existence, and was the outgrowth of this demand for freedom, it was felt to be necessary to have a National Woman's Suffrage Society formed. Notice was given to that effect, and at a large meeting, in which nineteen States were represented, a society 24 was formed, which for one year did most efficient service, holding conventions in many of our large cities, and awakening thought and action.

In Saratoga and Newport a new class was reached. Wearied with the monotony of fashionable dissipation and the driveling idiocy of flirtations, women were glad to hear a few sensible, wholesome truths.

In December, 1869, an able report was received from Mrs Kate N. Doggett, one of the six delegates to the Labor Convention, in Berlin, Prussia.

In the spring of 1869 an impulse was given to the work in the establishment of the Woman's Bureau, by Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps.

It was an experiment, and so far successful as to be felt through the entire country. Its discontinuance was due to the same cause which has thwarted so many plans of women. There were not a sufficient number possessed of wealth who had the will to thus appropriate it, and render this a permanent institution.

Mrs. Phelps possesses in an eminent degree all the requisites for such a post—a queenly hospitality, elegant manners, fine conversational ability, with a generous catholic spirit. Delicacy forbids saying all that the heart prompts of friends.

In November, 1869, a delegate Convention was held in Cleveland, Ohio, and society organized, called the American Woman's Suffrage Society. Its work is yet to be done.

The crowning act of the year 1869, and the one which gave an omen for the year that was approaching, was the enfranchising of the women of Wyoming and Utah. For these acts of justice we are most grateful. Leaving a space in our report for notes on a question so momentous, I am now, after more than a year, able to add the following from the territory:

“The cause of woman in Wyoming goes bravely on. At the last sitting of the District Court in Albany County, both the Grand and Petit Juries were equally composed of either sex; and Chief Justice Howe, presiding, took advantage of this occasion to compliment, in the highest terms, the intelligence, discrimination, honesty and propriety of conduct with which the women acquitted themselves last session, saying they had gone far to vindicate the policy, justify the experiment and realize

the expectations of those who had clothed themselves with the right. The bar, the bench and the intelligent men of the country had long felt that something was needed to improve and justify our jury system; something to lift it above prejudice and passion, and imbue it with a higher regard for law, justice, oath and conscience. His Honor then expressed the opinion that the introduction of the new element furnished good reason to expect that to women we should ultimately be 25 indebted for those reforms which the unaided exertions of men had been incompetent to effect." This is certainly a most flattering presentment of the results of enfranchising the sex in Wyoming, and what is better, it seems substantially a just one. The question will therefore naturally suggest itself, if women, in their new political capacity, are thus able to "tone" the rude elements of Western civilization, what inconsistency is there in granting them like privileges in communities whose superior refinement is so much less likely to expose them to insult or mortification?

In Utah it is of less account, because the women there are more under a hierarchy than elsewhere, and as yet vote only as directed.

In January, 1870, a Convention was called in Washington by the officers of the National Society. This meeting, large in attendance and deeply earnest, marked an historical era, the influence of which cannot be estimated for years. A hearing before the joint committee of the House and Senate of the District was asked, in order to present the question of woman suffrage, and granted. Elizabeth C. Stanton made the argument in favor of enfranchising the women of the District of Columbia. It was clear, incisive and cogent; divested of all sentiment, and condensed into a twenty-minutes' speech. It was very impressive. S. B. Anthony, Madame Anneke and others made a few pertinent remarks. At the close of the hearing, Hon. Charles Sumner said: "In my twenty years' experience in the Senate of the United States, I have never witnessed so fine a hearing as this one, so large an attendance and such respectful attention." Thus begins the national history of this great reform—a fit opening for 1870.

The work, not only in this country, but in Europe, was greatly accelerated by the publication of J. S. Mills' inestimable book, "The Subjection of Woman," which has been extensively circulated in a cheap form in this country, and has been translated and reprinted in France, Prussia and Russia.

The first National Woman Suffrage Convention was held in London, July, 1869, at which members of Parliament, Professors of Science—noble men and noble women, ennobled by this great work—took active part, and now women have the right of suffrage there in the municipal elections. The bill was introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright, and, says Prof. Fawcett: "In one night it passed beyond ridicule, so ably and calmly was it presented, and in less than one year it is a fixed fact."

How stands the comparison, Aristocratic England and Democratic America?

The Crown Princesses of Prussia and Italy are strong advocates of this movement, while women, who pay taxes in Austria and Russia, 26 voted and have a voice in making laws. Will America hold on to her barbarism in this, as she did to chattel slavery, till all the nations of the earth cry out against her wrong to womanhood?

Thus far I have said little of the new workers, or yet all that might be said of the staunch, tried and true friends. My aim has been rather to give the data of events, the salient points, giving honor where-ever it could be done without seeming flattery.

A few of the earlier women who came to this work should be named here. Sarah Helen Whitman was the first literary woman of reputation, who gave her name to the cause, and her interest has never lessened, though ill health has prevented any work.

Mrs. Martha Wright, sister of Lucretia Mott, of Auburn, has presided in most of the New York State Conventions, and in some of the National, and her pen has always been sharpened in ready defence of the cause and the active workers. A woman of rare good sense and large sympathies, she is to be trusted in emergencies.

Alice Cary for years gave her heartiest sympathy to the movement, and socially she and her sister Phebe have awakened an interest in a large circle not easily penetrated by outside influences. Her story, never completed, of the "Born Thrall," published in *The Revolution*, gave evidence of thought, experience and deep feeling.

The sweet songs of the sisters have a new sweet sadness, now that Alice is singing hers on the other side of the river of life.

Grace Greenwood has done good service with her fluent pen and voice in the Lyceums and conventions.

Mary L. Booth, with her rich culture and her unsurpassed practical ability, her skill as a translator of Martin's great History of France, and numberless other works, as given aid to the cause with her pen, one of the best in the country. As an editor she has done a great work for women by showing that a woman can work as earnestly and persistently at a closely confining business as a man, and can hold for years a place at the head of the profession, so difficult and so arduous.

As physicians many women have won not only fame but wealth. The names are too many for our limits. A few only who have an active interest in the principles which we have been urging can be given. Dr. Mercy B. Jackson, Dr. Ann Preston and Dr. Clemence Lozier are some of the names which stand out conspicuously.

The Government appointments within the last two years have been a matter of great rejoicing. Many responsible offices are held by women in different localities. There are 1,400 Postmistresses, some of them of first-class offices. The one in Richmond, Va., is considered a model office, held by Miss Elizabeth Van Lew.

27

Ten years ago a young girl sprang, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, fully armed, into the moral and political arena, and has stirred the heart of the Nation as no other speaker ever did. Anna E. Dickinson has never feared to utter the boldest truths, has never shrunk from, or withheld the most scathing rebukes of sin in high places, has never faltered or failed in principle, and yet is to-day a far more popular lecturer than those who have pandered to a corrupt, vitiated public taste. Does not this prove that the deep heart of the people is better than it has the credit of being.

About the same time Theodore Tilton threw into the scale his brilliant and varied talents, and the Independent, of which he was editor, was found on the side of freedom for all.

Judge S. E. Sewall, always on the right side in every good work, published, in 1868, a digest of the laws of Massachusetts in relation to woman's disabilities, which has done a good work. later, Prof. Hickox prepared one of like character for Connecticut, which rouses women to white heat.

Within the last two years of the second decade so many have been the new workers that a few only can be named.

Standing first is Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, a woman of rare powers of oratory. Possessing a magnetism which grasps and holds her audience whether they will or no, she pours out vehemently her flood of truth. She is a special pleader, and if her logic is not always perfect it is most effective, for she has the power of unlocking the hearts of her hearers. She has made within the last two years extensive lecturing tours in the North and West, and verging toward the South.

Mrs. Julia Ward Howe came in November, 1868, and laid her rich gifts on the altar of freedom, and has often been heard in conventions, and twice or thrice before the Legislature of Massachusetts,

Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker, from the family of ministers, also came about this time with her ready available talents.

Phebe Couzins, Lilie Peckham and Kate Stanton, alike generous, enthusiastic, cultured, and above all of high-toned principles, form a trio of young workers.

The stage gave Olive Logan, too well known to need words of praise. Fashion released the generous, self-sacrificing Laura C. Bullard, editor of the Revolution , and, filled with an earnest desire to do good, she has devoted herself to her work.

Augusta Larned, whose pen is well-known to the readers of the many papers where her stories have been told, is steadily and persistently at work.

Charlotte B. Wilbour, gifted in a high degree, calm in judgment and steady in purpose, is always a tower of strength.

28

Celia Burleigh, graceful, poetic and earnest, is equally at home on the platform or in the drawing-room.

L. D. Blake, always ready with pen or voice; and last, though not least, Adelle Hazlit, with flashing wit, keen intellect, and more than ordinary consecration to the work; a willingness to make sacrifices for it; a spirit of self-renunciation, the price of usefulness.

Myra Bradwell, with her legal knowledge, is another to be grateful for; and with pride the name of Elizabeth O. Willard is recorded as having given her rare gifts to this work.

In naming the younger workers, we gladly pay tribute to James W. Stillman, of Rhode Island, who has given most generously of time, money, and, above all, talents, to this cause, and that, at a time when ridicule and even the sacrifice of position followed. His logical argument on the inherent right of self-government has done great service.

Looking back over the range of national workers, the name of Harriet Tracy Cutler is one which is widely honored. She was one to accept the truth when there was much sacrifice socially in doing so. Another of this class is Mrs Josephine S. Griffing, a woman of rare endowments intellectually, with a heart as true and gentle as God ever gave to woman. Modest, almost to a fault, she is the unseen power that moves the machinery in the very heart of the nation; asking no recognition, no applause,

she works on with a steady, systematic, careful earnestness which commands the respect of the best and wisest.

Early among women journalists Mrs. Jane G. Swisshelm stands out conspicuously. Some time in 1842 or '43 she commenced the Pittsburg Saturday Visitor, which she edited for several years with marked ability. It was the paper most often quoted, and made war upon by all opposers of progress.

Mrs. C. I. H. Nichols also edited the Windham Co. Democrat in Brattleboro, Vt., with much ability, and though less radical and aggressive than Mrs. Swisshelm's paper, I am told that it is to the seed sown by her head and hands that all the spirit of progress there is in that county is due.

There is yet one other name that well deserves not one page but many, for his good deeds and unselfish work. A man with a strong, vigorous mind, a quick conception of principle, and perfectly fearless in his advocacy of them, holding always his personality so in reserve as sometimes to be overlooked among the many more forthputting. Parker Pillsbury was for some time editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, and co-editor of the Revolution. His pen, wherever found, has always been sharpened against wrong and injustice, and has done for the Woman cause an incalculable amount of good. His editorials 29 have been marked by an almost prophetic spirit; and the profoundness of their thought will be more justly appreciated as there is a larger development and a higher demand for unqualified justice.

The Hutchinson family were among our earliest workers, giving of time and money liberally without regard to party or sectionalism. Mr. John Hutchinson and family went through Kansas with the lecturing tourists, in 1867, and with their inspiring songs for freedom did much toward increasing the vote for woman suffrage in the West. They still continue their work penetrating into the most benighted regions, and, asking for freedom for temperance, for peace, and the reign of righteousness; they are doing their quota in the world's great work.

Mrs. Mary F. Davis has been from the first a most able and efficient worker, the more efficient that her winning, gentle manners, her courtesy and respect for the rights of others have been unvarying. If not herself aggressive, she has never faltered in her adherence to the fullest truth; in this she is always sustained by Mr. Davis, who has never hesitated or temporized on any great question.

Mrs. Cora L. V. Tappan is another whose name and reputation are national. She has spoken more frequently and to larger audience, and on a greater variety of subjects, than almost any other lecturer. Never identified with any party, she has, nevertheless, done a great work in a most womanly way. She has practically protested against a false and unholy marriage, because purity and harmony were necessities of her life. She has constantly, by precept and example, presented the

highest and purest ideal life. The author of many poems, her own life is a poem in itself of infinite sweetness and beauty, if report speaks correctly.

Among business women who have gone steadily on in the path of duty, doing its daily routine, the name of Mrs. Charlotte F. Wells stands out conspicuously. For over thirty years she has been an equal in all business relations with her husband, conducting the extensive business correspondence of the house, as well as being head book-keeper. Her serene face gives evidence of a life of quiet, self-respecting independence.

Mrs. F. V. Hallock is another woman whose name, with that of her 30 sister, Mrs R. Dale Owen, are found to hold a place worthy of honorable mention for their good works and steady adherence to truth, and their clear, quick comprehension of its far-reaching power.

Rev. Phebe Hanaford, pastor of a church in New Haven, Conn., has done a great work for woman, both with voice and pen. She is the mother of a family, and finds time not only to conduct their education, but to preach regularly every Sabbath, to write books of merit, and to superintend her domestic affairs, which are managed with skill, economy and good taste. Always cheerful and kindly, she wins many friends, not only to herself but for the cause.

There is another movement that began in this decade now closed upon us, which properly belongs to its history, viz: that of the working women. It has been represented from Boston by Jennie Collins, a slight woman, all brain and soul. She tells her touching stories with such a tender, natural pathos that few eyes are dry during her speeches. She makes no pretense, but gives most unmistakable evidence of a rich nature that has been repressed and tortured. She is the type of a large class that will develop into beautiful, symmetrical women when the shackles are broken and they are free.

Conventions and organizations have so multiplied that it would require a volume to give their history. The chief of these are the great Northwestern and the Pacific Slope Association. Added to these are the State Societies in nearly all the Northern and Middle States. A State Society was organized in Richmond, Virginia, in April, 1870.

Lectures have been given in several of the Southern States by individuals.

If the notices of women are by far more numerous than those of men, it is not from forgetfulness of the services of men, for I credit them with all sincerity of motive and nobleness in the wish for our enfranchisement; but my object is to show how largely women do desire their enfranchisement, and have made it a life work to secure freedom for themselves and others.

I have given, as briefly as possible, the two decades from 1850 to 1870. I have set down nothing in malice, and what is omitted must be charged to want of space and time. When the full history of this 31 work is written, differences which have retarded its progress, and the wide range of action and reaction can be gone into if the historian so wills.

I have endeavored to keep this history free from sectionalism and faction believing that the *finale* would bring together all parties in one glad day of rejoicing. That there *will* be political parties in the future, with women, as with men, there can be no question; but that the sexes will have a purifying influence, each upon the other, is already conceded even by the opposers.

In closing this *resume* permit me to say that this meagre outline, condensed from notes made from year to year, in no way satisfies the writer, but has been given by the earnest solicitation of friends, who wish that the steady progress of the cause may be marked by this retrospective hour.

There is much that should have been embodied in this sketch of the past, especially the resolutions which have marked varying phases of the work, and which seemed like a divine inspiration in their comprehensive grasp and far-reaching thought, on this the last great question of reform.

ADDRESSES.

Mrs. Mott rose at the conclusion of Mrs. Davis' history of the work for the past twenty years, and expressed herself as greatly pleased with its succinct and careful preparation. She felt that it was of great importance to the future work that this history be preserved, and hoped it would be published as part of the proceedings of this meeting. She felt that we had lost in not having kept more careful record of the progress of the work. She was sorry Mrs. Davis had not said more of herself, as she had done much toward opening the medical profession to women, and also in making the lecturing field a lucrative and respectable profession for them. She was, I believe, the first woman to claim the right in this to equal pay with men for her lectures.

Mrs. L. Mott said: "Among Quakers there had never been any talk of woman's rights—it was simply human rights; and in Nantucket, which was founded by the Quakers, the women had always transacted business. Their husbands were much of the time away at sea, and so they became merchants, and went to and fro between Boston and the island, taking with them their oil, their candles and their whalebone, and returning with such dry-goods and groceries as were needed on the island. Women were now received as pastors of churches and teachers. They received, in some places, a salary greater than any men teachers.

Mrs. Stanton followed Mrs. Mott, and expressed the same pleasure in listening to the report, and satisfaction in its historical accuracy and 32 completeness, but said she thought Mrs. Davis, in her modesty, had not done justice to herself; her work commenced before any of the woman's right conventions were held. As early as 1844 she commenced the study of anatomy and physiology, and gave public lectures on these subjects. She sent to Paris and imported the first *Femme modele* that was ever brought into the country. She has told me many amusing anecdotes of the effect of unveiling this manikin in the presence of a class of ladies. Some would leave the house, others faint in their seats, others draw down their veils, and a few only had the moral hardihood and scientific curiosity to appreciate it and examine the fearful and wonderful manner in which they were made. In course of time, however, these natural "weaknesses and disabilities" were overcome, and many of Mrs. Davis' classes are to-day professors as well pupils in our medical colleges, hospitals and dissecting-rooms, the result of her early efforts in urging the medical education of women. Many who are now comfortably supporting themselves in that profession gratefully acknowledge her influence in directing the whole future of their lives.

Mrs. Davis took an active part too in the early movements for "Moral Reform," and was a contributor to "McDowall's Journal" and "Woman's Advocate," which were published for many years. She established too the first woman's rights paper ever published in this country, "The Una," in January, 1852. In looking over the pages of this paper it is surprising to see how perfectly the leaders of this movement understood all the bearings of this question, and with what boldness they followed the truth in all directions, in the consideration of woman's social as well as political wrongs. I state these facts in regard to Mrs. Davis, that our report, which is to be published, may do full justice to all.

RESOLUTIONS.

The following resolutions which had been prepared by Committee, were then offered for discussion by S. B. Anthony:

"Resolved, That at the close of over twenty years of persistent agitation, petitioning State Legislatures and Congress for the right of suffrage, we, who inaugurated this reform, now demand the immediate adoption of the Sixteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, that shall prohibit any State from disfranchising any of its citizens on the ground of sex; and whatever national party does this act of justice, fastens the keystone in the arch of the Republic.

"Resolved, That as neither free trade, finance, prohibition, capital and labor, nor any other political question, can be so vital too the existence of the Republic as the enfranchisement of women, it is

clearly our duty 33 to aid and support the great national party that shall first inscribe *woman suffrage* on its banner.

"Resolved, That our thanks are due to the Democratic party of Utah and Wyoming for securing to woman her right of suffrage in those Territories.

"Resolved, That the Democratic party of Kansas, in declaring, at its recent convention at Topeka, the enfranchisement of women in its judgment a most reasonable and timely enterprise, no longer to be justly postponed, is entitled to the hearty support of the friends of our cause throughout the world.

"Resolved, That the American Equal Rights Association, in sending Susan B. Anthony to the National Convention in 1868, and the Massachusetts Suffrage Association, in sending Mary A. Livermore to the Republican and Democratic State Conventions in 1870, have inaugurated the right political action, which should be followed up in the National and State Conventions throughout the country.

"Resolved, That we rejoice in the fact that the Republican Legislatures of Iowa and other Western States have submitted to the people the proposition to strike the word "male" from their Constitutions.

"Resolved, That it is as disastrous to human progress to teach women to bow down to the authority of man, as divinely inspired, as it is to teach man to bow down to the authority of Kings and Popes, as divinely ordained, for in both cases we violate the fundamental idea on which a Republican government and the Protestant religion are based— *the right of individual judgment*.

"Whereas, The accident of sex no more involves the capacity to govern a family than does the accident of Papal election or royal birth the capacity to govern a dominion or a kingdom; therefore,

"Resolved, That the doctrine of woman's subjection, enforced from the text, 'Wives, submit yourselves unto your husbands,' should be thrown aside, with the exploded theories of kingcraft and slavery, embodied in the injunctions, 'Honor the King,' and 'Servants, obey your masters.'

"Resolved, That as the gravest responsibilities of social life must ever rest on the mother of the race, therefore, law, religion and public sentiment, instead of degrading her as the subject of man, should unitedly declare and maintain her sole and supreme sovereignty over her own person."

Mrs. Gage very sensibly spoke of the advance in the cause of education for women, and reviewed in a careful manner the progress in each particular branch of science.

Several letters from various parts of the world were read by Mrs. 34 Griffing and Mrs. Lillie Devereux Blake, the latter of whom demonstrated in an amusing and forcible manner that the women of our country did not form a part of the "people," according to the various banners and posters displayed about the streets in reference to the coming election. She did want to vote; she did love her country; but because she was not one of the "people," that privilege was denied her.

Miss Anthony made several characteristic short speeches at intervals, in a style which is peculiarly her own. Her force and humor were fully appreciated by the audience, who applauded her repeatedly. Her "Cash" and "Dollar-and-cent" doctrine met with great favor.

Mrs. Stanton, in a few words, stated the subject of her evening's lecture, and the Rev. Olympia Brown made several stirring remarks in reference to woman's work in the cause of the "social evil," speaking at some length upon the action of the women of England on the subject.

Mr. Crozier, of Brooklyn, was the only gentleman who spoke, and he acquitted himself very creditably in his confession upon joining the cause of woman's rights.

Several resolutions were offered in reference to the European war, and much sympathy was expressed with the present suffering originated by it. The improved condition of Italy was also referred to.

The Convention was a highly interesting one in many particulars, and the pioneers of the cause who engage in active service twenty years ago proved themselves as business-like and ardent as at that time.

The following letters were then read:

FROM FRANCIS POWER COBBE.

26 Hereford Square, London.

Dear Madam:

I received your kind letter some weeks ago, and beg to apologize for the delay of this reply. Pray accept my thanks for your kind expressions regarding my shall efforts to keep alive the great cause we have all so near at heart. I regret to hear that one who, like yourself, has been a pioneer on the way when the path was the ruggedest, should for many years have been incapacitated from aiding its progress. May you now be restored fully to activity. We certainly want all true workers, albeit the

progress of the cause surpasses our most sanguine expectations, as well as that on this side of the Atlantic.

Pray accept my thanks for your kind invitation to your Convention. It will not, I think, ever be likely that I shall visit America, but I shall always read with deep interest of all that goes forward there.

Accept, dear madam, my thanks for your kindness and sincere regard.

Mrs. P. W. Davis. Francis Power Cobbe.

FROM MR. KINGSLEY.

Morningside, Edinburgh, Sept. 24, 1870.

Madam:

I regret that I am unable to accept the invitation with which you have honored me, for I have been an invalid for some months, and am not sufficiently well to undertake any journey.

35

I can assure you that the cause of women is gradually but firmly gaining ground in Scotland, and that each month we are gaining in the right direction. At present there are six female medical students studying in our university. The College of Surgeons has thrown its doors open, without any restriction, to the female student.

The Merchants' Maiden Company has, within the last few months, opened large schools in connection with its hospitals, offering as its prizes Bursaries in the university to girls as well as boys, which I think is one of the strongest moves which as yet has been made in behalf of women.

The petition in favor of the medical education of women was largely signed in Scotland. The Society for the Higher Education of Women is progressing well, and the professors spoke highly of the efficiency of their working pupils.

In the university classes of botany and natural history all the female students were in the honor list, and Miss Edith Pechey was the first chemistry student of the year.

With best wishes and thanks to you and your committee for your kind invitation, I am truly yours, S. K. Kingsley, for Henry Kingsley.

FROM HON. JACOB BRIGHT.

Alderly Edge, near Manchester, Sept. 26, 1870.

Madam:

I beg to thank you for the circular and your accompanying note, both inviting me to attend the Twentieth Anniversary of the inauguration of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the United States, to be held in New York on the 20th and 21st of October. I have once traveled through your country with very much pleasure, and, I hope, with some, profit, and I have a strong desire to come again; but as it is impossible for me to do so now I cannot attend your meeting.

I need not say that I sympathize with your object. It seems to me to be inconsistent with the principles of your Government, and of ours, to deny to women the power to control those who legislate for them. Until they obtain this control through the suffrage, they will suffer many disadvantages and be the victims of unequal laws. How soon they will obtain it must depend mainly upon their own efforts. In the meantime the present agitation will give them an interest in many public questions, will in itself be an education in preparation for political power, and will exercise an influence in favor of more equal legislation between men and women.

Very truly yours, Mrs. P. W. Davis. Jacob Bright

FROM MRS. DR. TAYLOR.

Notting Hill, August 10, 1870.

Dear Madam:

I cordially thank you for your kind request that I should attend your Convention in October. It is quite impossible for me to leave England now, but I am deputed by our London Committee for Woman's Suffrage to express their sympathy with your movement, and the hope that the efforts you are making will be crowned with success, and that Mrs. Lucretia Mott will live to see the fruit of some of her good and noble work.

Believe me yours truly, M. Taylor.

FROM LADY AMBERLY.

Rodborough Manor, Stroud, July 14, 1870.

Dear Madam:

I thank you much for your invitation to attend your second decade meeting of the Woman's Suffrage Association.

36

I regret that it will not be in my power to accept it. Much as I enjoyed my visit to America, it is rather too far to undertake a second journey there.

You must, indeed, be glad, after twenty years of work, to see the great advance in public opinion on this question. It seems now to be progressing very fast. I have just aided in establishing a committee at Stroud, and we hope soon to have one in every borough in England for female suffrage.

Yours truly, Kate Amberly. Mrs. P. W. Davis.

Malvern, England, Sept., 1870.

Dear Mrs. Davis:

I have your letter reminding me that I was one of the first women in America who labored for the rights of woman, and inviting me to be present at your Convention.

I cannot come; but my interest in the freedom of woman has not in the least abated during thirty years of labor and prayer for her emancipation. I claim one right for woman which includes all human rights; it is that she be free to obey the Divine law of her own life that she be *not subjected to the lustful despotism of one man, or to the selfish or unwise legislation* of many. As a Roman Catholic, I claim for woman that she be free to become the pure daughter of the Mother of our Lord, either as virgin or wife. I claim for the maiden that she be free to engage in works of charity or money, or in any art or profession suited to her ability. I claim for the wife that she be free to bear her babes for the love of God and her husband, and that they be not *forced upon her in fear of hate*.

Those who have protested against the Church and separated from her have carried with them little of the veneration for woman that has ever existed in the hearts of true Catholics. The Church has placed no hindrance in the way of woman, though individuals calling themselves Catholics may have done so. Loan of Arc has ever been considered next to a saint in the Church, though her enemies burned her as a witch. St. Catherine, of Siena, went like a prophetess to the Pope of her day, and feared not to rebuke him. She knew that the infallibility of the appointed Head of the Church,

acting in the Divine Order and speaking as the inspired Vicar of Christ, gives him no immunity from weakness and sinfulness as a man. St. Catherine's prudence and perseverance induced Urban VI to seek and follow her counsels in political affairs, and through her wisdom was brought about the renewed residence of the Pope in his own city. When the Christian world was Catholic, women were not excluded from royal council chambers nor from deliberative assemblies. Venerable Abbesses had their seats in parliaments.

In the Church the name of St. Scholastica is more than the shadow of her glorious brother, St. Benedict; St. Clara was not the mere echo of St. Francis. St. Catherine of Siena, St. Bridget of Sweden, St. Theresa, St. Gertrude, were in effect Doctors of the Church. St. Catherine of Genoa wrote a treatise on Purgatory which is the most highly esteemed book on the subject. Rose of Castile (the mother of St. Louis), St. Jane Frances di Chantal, Helena Carnaro, Mrs. Seton, Mother Margaret, and hosts of others. Women in every incident of their lives give us ample proof that the Church never desired to silence women or diminish her usefulness when she has spoken wisely or done well.

Nor is this a thing of the past. Mother Margaret, the poor Irish servant girl, who refounded the Dominican order of nuns in England, founded five convents, built several churches, and established orphanages and hospitals, has but just ended her remarkable career, and her life is now being read all over England, and I hope in America also.

I heartily bid God-speed to every righteous effort to promote the freedom of woman in love and wisdom, and the consequent purity and health of her own life and that of her children. Woman is the mother of the human race, and the elevation and salvation of man depends on her. Who then will not work for the freedom of woman?

Yours always, Paulina W. Davis. Mary S. G. Nichols.

37

Naples, October 10, 1870.

Dear Mrs. Davis:

I have only now received your letter, or I should sooner have expressed now highly I am gratified by the honor you do me in asking my opinions with regard to woman suffrage. I cannot more strongly show my sympathy with my accomplished sisters in the United States, than by saying that I signed a petition to the British Parliament, requesting permission for women to vote at the elections. It was rejected, for the opposition and prejudices of the men in Great Britain are still very strong against any change in our condition. We have, however, gained a most important privilege lately, chiefly

through the liberality of the University of Cambridge, in having the opportunity of acquiring every branch of knowledge literary and scientific.

We owe much to the society of which you are the secretary, for persevering in our behalf for twenty years under strong opposition. The progress of civilization will ultimately emancipate half the human race from the low position in which we have hitherto been kept.

Accept, dear Mrs. Davis, my thanks for your letter, and believe me, Very sincerely yours, Mary Somerville.

Victoria Press, London, Oct. 3, 1870.

My Dear Mrs. Davis and Mrs. Stanton:

Will you kindly let me answer both your notes together, and assure you how much I value the feeling which prompted you to write them. I shall not easily part with either of those letters, although pressure of work drives me to answer them in one, and say that I am utterly unable to respond to your wish that I should attend your Decade Meeting.

Few things would give me such satisfaction as to find myself in America, especially after your noble invitations and promises of a cordial reception everywhere.

But—and how many buts there are in life—I dare not leave my work at present in England. There are several very important movements just now resting almost entirely upon me, and having put my hand to the plow, I dare not look back.

I am at present the only regular lecturer here on this subject, and I am full of engagements up to April next—north, south, east and west—and the discussion society I have started in London is still too young to run alone, and yet promises such good things for the future, that I feel it ought to be carefully tended.

I can only add that I shall watch with great interest for the accounts of your meeting on the 19th. I long for the day when I can see you in the flesh—those with whose spirits I now ever hold communion.

Excuse haste. I have just returned from the North, and find my table overwhelmed with invitations to lecture, and appeals for help. The learned meetings and social discussions of the British Associations

at Liverpool, and the Social Science Congress at Newcastle, have all been crowded into the last fortnight.

Wishing you and your noble workers God-speed, believe me, Yours, most truly, Emily Faithful.

San Francisco, Oct. 18, 1870.

My Dear Mrs. Davis:

Your kind note of invitation has just reached me, having been forwarded from place to place following my migration to this western shore.

Most gladly should I unite with the dear friends who were foremost in the work, but the distance prevents. I write knowing that this will not reach you in time for the Convention, yet that you may know how heartily I should co-operate with you were it possible.

38

Reviewing the section of the past twenty years, we have every reason to be encouraged with the results of all the efforts thus far made in the advocacy of those interests brought so distinctly before the first National Convention. Woman's right to education in all departments is now, in part or in whole, conceded by every State in the Union. Her avocations have been correspondingly enlarged and compensated more justly, and her relations to the Government as a citizen are, in part at least, conceded.

Looking at the results of the labor of the past twenty years, we may thank God and take courage. With so large an area over which to diffuse our efforts, with no means in our hands adequate to extensive canvassing, with the prejudices of the church and the traditions of law all against us, it seems to me that our progress is little short of miraculous. A little more effort, a little more patient waiting, and I have full faith to believe that our desires will be realized in the full enfranchisement of all the women of our land.

Yours for the cause, H. M. Tracy Cutler.

280 Park Road, South Hill, Liverpool.

Dear Madam:

Mrs. Butler regrets very much not to have been able to write to you before, and begs you will kindly accept her apologies as well as her thanks for your invitation to your Decade Meeting. I have the

honor and privilege to be at present Mrs. Butler's Secretary. She is overwhelmed with work, and would be thankful for your sympathy in it. I wish I could give you a clear idea of the battle she has to fight, but it is very difficult for me, as a German, to put it in adequate words.

Mrs. Butler's introductory essay to "Woman's Work and Woman's Culture" only gives a faint idea of her character and strivings, compared to the grand reality of her life. She has devoted more than fifteen years to the rescue of "fallen women"—a work that requires more active charity and self-denial than any other. The English Parliament passed, some time ago, certain acts called the Contagious Disease Acts, as a sanitary measure, on the model of Continental legislation. To earnest, religious minds, like Mrs. Butler's, the acts appear immoral in principle, as declaring vice a necessity; unjust, as inflicting penalties on women and letting men go free; and cruel in their application, enrolling women in a degraded class, making their return to virtue almost impossible. I think if I tell you that by these acts a woman can be arrested by a policeman on suspicion of being a prostitute, and subjected to an examination which amounts to a surgical operation, always disgraceful, sometimes injurious, even dangerous, I have made quite clear to an American Lady that such a state of things cannot be endured.

The best English women, with Mrs. Butler and Miss Nightingale as leaders, stand up nobly for the poor, degraded women whom, with their true Christian hearts, they still recognize as sisters. Mrs. Butler, who is rather delicate, devotes all her strength to this cause at present. She travels much, has been in the garrison towns, where, for the benefit of the soldiers, these atrocious acts are in force, and in large meetings denounces the cruelties to women. By her efforts more than sixty thousand signatures have been obtained for the repeal of the acts. Many good men, I am thankful to say, are on our side, and it is a matter of congratulation that in this point many people join who widely differ in other respects.

I firmly believe that this question, which can no longer be avoided, will produce a great social reform. Women who timidly keep aloof from all political movements, after this experience of male legislation, eagerly demand the suffrage.

I am sure you will forgive Mrs. Butler for not writing herself. As soon as she has a little more breathing time she is sure to write, but she fears she will never be able to cross the Atlantic.

Yours sincerely, Rosa Bruhn. Mrs. P. W. Davis.

Dear Mrs. Davis:

Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe says: "The great cause is bound to go. * * This is a thing coming in the progress of society so surely that no man or woman can do much to help or hinder, in the long run." Therefore let the Star, the Tribune and all the rest of the opposition papers,, do their best to hinder the movement. Mrs. Partington long ago set them an illustrious example when she tried to keep back the waters of the Atlantic with her broom.

The twentieth anniversary of the declaration of the national independence of women will be celebrated in this city to-morrow. A few days since our Cuban friends celebrated their first anniversary with salutes, banners and speeches. It would be perfectly proper for the woman to order a salute to be fired from the City Hall park. We are sure our gallant Mayor would not object.

Nothing of this noisy nature is likely to take place, however. Let all such powder-burnings be left to men and boys who know no better. Women are not aggressive in this movement; they are not up in arms; their revolution appeals to the morals and intellects of the race, and has nothing to do with the brute force. H.B.S.

Paris, Rue Nollet 92, 7th September.

Dear Madam

I burned the answer I had written to you under the shameful government now fallen, and whose crimes and treasons extorted from me cries of despair for the ruin they have brought on our country.

I thank you for the generous sympathy you express toward us in our great woe. Your honored names have been blessed for this by our French hearts. We are now relieved, and thought our actual peril is none the less, we are in possession of our own force. We are rid of the despicable robbers of our honor, our fortune and our lives; and in the most terrible energy, is a consolation and support. Better it is so die with honor than live dishonored.

How happy you are to be born on a soil not infested by monarchical roots. They are like dog-grass, which springs up again and again, nurtured by the ignorance of our rural population. When the Prussians shall have been driven away, we may have civil struggles to fear from the emissaries of this detested monarchy. What avails experience to the blind.

I forwarded immediately your letter to George Sand. Accept my heartfelt thanks for your fraternal invitation to me.

Yes, you say right, our hearts are wholly absorbed, and no place is ours but Paris in this hour of supreme struggle and sacrifice. We shall be with you in thought only, dear sisters—you, the pioneers in woman's emancipation—your names are enshrined in our hearts; but this crisis here will not be useless for the cause. The women of Paris are noble and courageous; one may hear them in every group encouraging the men to desperate resistance. Everywhere they form societies for the relief of the distressed and the wounded. Many have petitioned for this revolution, and have instigated men to the accomplishment of it. Many will take arms in defence and fight; yea, fight with all the strength which desperation lends, should the struggle reach our streets. * * * *

They have already proved this sort of courage. Men feel now how very necessary their co-operation is, and after the crisis I hope they will not forget it.

But it is better that woman herself should learn to have a will, an active opinion in public affairs, and this disposition will, doubtless, continue to increase, as it has done for the last two years.

Hail, dear and valiant sisters; blessed be your work in which my heart, and many of those around me unite. Andre Leo.

Madame Paulina W. Davis. Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth C. Stanton, Martha Wright, Isabel Hooper.

40

To the Officers and Members of the Convention assembled at Apollo Hall, New York, to celebrate the Twentieth of the National Woman's Suffrage Association:

The undersigned have been instructed by the Board of Control of the California Woman Suffrage Society to send you greeting, and to express our cordial sympathy in behalf of the cause which has called you together. It would afford us great pleasure to be personally with you on this occasion, but the great distance rendering it impossible, we have commissioned Mrs. H. F. M. Brown and Mrs. F. M. Kimball, of Chicago, to represent our Society. They have long been workers in this cause, and have given abundant proof that they have a deep interest in everything that pertains to the elevation of woman.

The first organization on this coast to obtain the ballot for woman is but little more than a year old, and now we can number forty societies. A call has been issued for a Pacific Slope Convention, by which we hope to unite all the States and Territories west of the Rocky Mountains into one

solid working body. The Regents of the California State University have, within two weeks' time, by unanimous vote, opened the doors of that institution to women upon the same terms as men. The newly-elected Public School Superintendent of San Francisco has the power of appointing an Assistant-Superintendent. It is urged that a woman be selected for that situation, and the leading papers of this city are favor of such an appointment.

The California Legislative was last winter largely petitioned to strike the word "male" from its constitution, but for prudential reasons it was not pressed to a vote. The Pioneer, edited by Mrs. Pitt Stevens, is the only paper devoted to the enfranchisement of women on this coast. To it is largely due the change of public sentiment which has been so rapidly effected within the last two years.

The next legislature of Nevada will no doubt vote to strike the word "male" from its constitution. We trust that the interest and intelligence of the people will be sufficient to second the action of the Legislature. Wyoming has already proved that it is a wise to invest women with the elective franchise.

At an election in September the women generally voted, thus answering the objection often urged that women would not vote if they had the power, and proving, according to the testimony or eye-witnesses, that the purification of the ballot-box was visibly the result. From private correspondence we learn that Oregon is on the eve of organization. The Governors of Colorado and Arizona, as well as the respective judges of the Supreme Courts, are warm advocates of woman's enfranchisement. In Utah, woman already has the ballot.

Our society looks with hope to the action of the friends of our cause at the East. The division there has saddened and somewhat discouraged us at times, but we hope and believe that soon all minor considerations will be forgotten in the one united effort to give the women of the land a legal existence.

With sentiments of highest esteem, on behalf of the Board of Control of the California Woman Suffrage Association, C. H. Spear, C. M. Parker, Pres't Board Cal. W. S. A. Sec. Board Control, Cal. W. S. A.

Dear Ladies:

It would give me great pleasure to accept your kind invitation to be present at your meeting to-day, if it were possible, but it is not.

Go on with your great work; it is arduous, but it is sublime! You are doing good that you know not of in old Europe. You have taken the initiative, and she is following hard after.

I wish to recommend to you the appeal of Mme. Gasparin to the American women to join in her heart-cry for peace. Coming, so recently as I have, from the seat of war—from Paris and from Rome—I can testify to the earnest, the beseeching appeal of European women to their sisters in America to give them help in this hour of calamity and need—the help of sympathy, the succor of love!

The day before I left France, one of the noblest of French women, Mademoiselle Daubie (the distinguished author of that remarkable work, "The Poor Women of the Nineteenth Century," which every woman and legislator ought to read), said to me: "We are looking wistfully every whither for some hand stretched out through the darkness, but, alas! there is none. But you are going to America. O! tell the women there to help us in this struggle with ignorance, corruption and war." "Let us heed this cry.

France lies prostrate in the dust! But Rome is free! So in all human sorrow there is some hope. Let us, then, lift up the one by all possible help, remembering her greatness, and pity her misfortunes; having faith in her capabilities, and praying for her liberty—for that liberty that can only be practicable when built upon intelligence and virtue, and only real when woman is not the slave, but the helpmate of man; and let us rejoice with that other sister—Italia—who is now lifting up her face toward Heaven, and after these long years of anguish and waiting the mother is restored to her children!

The rule of the Cæsars is gone, and the reign of absolutism is passing away! And while the science of men goes flashing round the earth—over sea and land—uniting the nations in treaties of commerce and compacts of liberty, the warm, generous heart of woman shall keep pace, uniting humanity in sympathy and love.

I am, dear ladies, yours most respectfully, Emelia J. Meriman.

Mrs. A. H. Price was introduced and read the following poem:

DECADE MEETING.

We meet once more, with thanks and tears
For what we've gained and what we've lost;
Our little bark for twenty years
Has been on stormy billows tost.

But still we see a beacon-light
Shine ever on our darkened way;
And love of Truth, and love of Right,
Shall guide us to the perfect day.

Freedom and Rights must plow Deep furrows in this hardened soil; Man *must* his proud will humbly bow, And cease God's heritage to spoil.

Then the true Woman will appear, Clothed in a robe of perfect love, The altar of sweet peace to rear, Girt with the wisdom from above.

Then shall earth's Eden-home be ours. Regained by hands that wrought the fall; Adorned by her, its happy bowers With mother-love shall shelter all.

42

DECADE SPEECH, ON THE PROGRESS OF EDUCATION AND INDUSTRIAL AVOCATIONS FOR WOMEN. BY MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE.

Twenty years ago the first National Woman's Rights Convention was held in Worcester, Massachusetts, and was presided over by our present honored Chairman, Mrs. Davis.

The reform had for years been agitated in a small way, and conventions had been held at different points but, until the Worcester Convention, none of these had arisen to the dignity of national.

Great has been the change since that Convention, whose second decade we celebrate, and it has fallen upon me to especially call your attention to the advanced educational facilities enjoyed by the women of 1870, compared with those enjoyed by the women of 1850, and which are the legitimate outgrowth of the woman movement.

The progress of education for women for years very slow. Although the first grant of land in the United States for a public school-house was made by a woman, it was not the sex to which she belonged that enjoyed its benefits. Even the common-school system of Massachusetts, which is pointed to with so much pride, was originated for boys alone. Thomas Hughes, in his Boston speech the other day, declared that England had derived her educational inspiration from the common school system of Massachusetts. It was the admission of girls to its benefits, an admission primarily made by certain districts to secure their quota of school money. It was the admission of girls to common-school advantages, which made of that system what it now is.

Twenty years ago girls stood upon an equality with boys in common-schools, but not elsewhere had they equal educational advantages. Two colleges at that time, Oberlin and Antioch, professed to admit women upon an equality, but in 1850, no woman in them was allowed to deliver, or even *read*

her own graduating oration. Her presence upon the platform was considered out of place, and if her thoughts were given to the world, the college demanded their utterance through a man's mouth.

In looking over the Holliday library recently sold at auction in this city, I found a book of political caricatures. They were English—coarse, colored wood-prints, but very sharp and laughable. One of them represented a noted politician with a speaking trumpet to his mouth, but he did not give utterance to his own thoughts, for the trumpet passed through the head and out of the mouth of another man. Just so at Oberlin, twenty years ago, were the orations of women graduates trumpeted to the world through a man's mouth. But in 1853, such had already been the advance of public opinion in regard to woman's opportunities, that Oberlin College authorities granted its lady graduates permission to read their orations, though under strict charge not to lay aside the protecting paper. A brave young girl ascended the platform with her oration in her hand, placed it behind her, and, to the astonishment of the faculty and the delight of her hearers, delivered it unaided by man or paper. This was a step in the education of woman whose ultimate results have not yet been reached.

Buckle says the boasted civilizations of antiquity were eminently one-sided, and that they fell because society did not advance in all its parts, but sacrificed some of its constituents in order to secure the progress of others.

Through the past, this has been pre-eminently the case in regard to woman. Education, except in accomplishments, has been for her ignored. She has been called the ornament of life, and her advantages have been of an ornamental character. She has not been treated as a component part of humanity, but as a being having a life outside of her own interests, and not until she herself arose and demanded the enjoyment of all opportunities, was the plan of her education changed. The fact of such demand on the part women is in itself an evidence of advanced civilization.

Robert Spencer says, among all uncultivated people the idea of ornament precedes that of use, and that this holds good in regard to the mind as well as the body, and that the knowledge which conduces to well-being has been postponed to that which brings applause.

While men have failed to see woman's needs in respect to education, she has seen them herself, and step by step has claimed opportunities, until to-day the highest universities are opening their doors for her admission. Within the past year, Michigan University has admitted women, and at the present time, a period of only about seven months, there are seventeen women students in its medical department alone, besides those entered in its literary and legal departments.

In Iowa, the admission of women to all branches of its University, is rendered compulsory by her State Constitution.

Washington University, of Missouri, has just now opened its doors to women. Baker University, of Kansas; Howard University, of Washington; St. Lawrence University, of New York; and, I believe, also universities in Illinois and Indiana, admit women. So numerous are becoming the colleges and universities which admit women to equal educational advantages with men, or which have recently been founded for women alone, that I shall not attempt to give them more than a passing glance. Most States can boast those of greater or less reputation, and 44 each year—almost each month—adds to their number. One of the latest is the Regent's University, of California; and at our own Cornell University, a woman recently passed a successful examination. No State University can, in common equity, refuse to admit women, as the grant of public lands for their endowment was proportionate to the representation from each State, and women are counted equally with men as the basis of representation.

A good evidence of the change of thought in regard to woman's education is found in school advertisements. One, which recently caught my eye, was of an old school—now in its forty-third year—originally a boy's school. The present year's advertisement reads thus: "In accordance with the request of several families who wish their daughters to have education similar to their sons, girls will be admitted to all departments of the school."

Besides the schools, colleges and universities opening to women, we find the change of public sentiment has spread to Literary and Scientific Associations. Both in 1869 and '70, women were on the list of officers of the American Social Science Association, and many women have been received as members of Scientific Associations, and by Academies of Arts And Science. The New York State Historical Society has, within the year, admitted its first lady members, while the Historical Society of Chicago has, also within the year, conferred life-membership upon two women, and the State of Michigan has honored itself by appointing a woman State Librarian. Libraries for women have been instituted, and women have also formed themselves into Library Associations, into Art Associations, and into National Educational Associations. They have also been elected Superintendents of Schools, Principals of Normal and Grammar Schools, members of Board of Education, and in Kansas, Wisconsin and Michigan their votes have been made legal on all school questions. They fill, with distinguished honor, various College and University chairs, and not they alone, but their classes, give evidence of woman's capacity both as teacher and learner. Miss Maria Mitchell, of Vassar, one of our distinguished astronomers, has recently graduated a class of seventeen girls, after a three-years' course, having carried them as far as she could, and giving them credit for abstruse inquiries and profound mathematical knowledge.

Miss Mitchell herself has been connected with our Coast Survey, and the preparation of our Nautical Almanac. She has the title of Ph. D., and by Professor Agassiz' nomination, has become a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and also of the Academy of Arts and Science.

45

In the widely extended educational system of lectures, women and pre-eminent. They have been called upon to give commencement orations, even in colleges devoted to the education of boys alone. Fourth of July platforms have welcomed them, and in the Lyceum women are the brightest stars, and each season adds to their number.

In medical education woman is making rapid strides. Twenty years ago not a single Medical College for women was in existence, and but one or two women physicians who, by almost superhuman efforts, had obtained admission to lectures. Now, in the United States alone, there are seven medical colleges wholly for women, some of which were founded by women, and a few others which admit women with men. The first woman medical college was founded in Philadelphia, in 1853. The Dean of that institution, as well as the two in New York, is a woman. So accustomed has the public become to women in the medical capacity that woman's right to a medical education is less discussed than any other, and some four hundred graduated women physicians are now in regular practice with incomes all the way up to \$15,000 a year.

Not only this, but women have received appointments as city physicians, and as physicians in Colleges, in Alms-houses and in Lunatic Asylums. The prize offered by the "Medical Gazette" last year was carried off by a woman, and medical societies are receiving them as members; and although in some localities this meets with opposition, it requires no prophet's eye to see the final result. The American Institute of Homœopathy, at its annual meeting in 1869, passed a resolution by a large majority declaring that qualified physicians, men or women, were eligible to membership.

Not only are women demanded as physicians in our own country, but from India, where men are not permitted to treat women, the cry comes up to us for their help, and this field widens every day.

The next profession to welcome women was the Theological; and although women ministers have existed from the days of the Apostles to the mother of Wesley, and from her until now, and among the Quakers have always been recognized—a distinguished minister among them now occupying this platform—it is but of late that Theological schools have admitted them; and the first ordained woman minister in our own country only dates back to 1853, when Antoinette Brown was ordained and installed as pastor over a church in the State of New York. Now, a number of women, in various Christian bodies, hold pastorates, one of whom, Rev. Olympia Brown, is seated upon this platform.

She performs all the duties of a Christian minister to a church in Bridgeport, Connecticut, over which she is settled. Let me just whisper 46 here that she has a theological student under her instruction, that she performs marriages—and the courts have declared marriages by women ministers to be legal, thus stamping the sanction of the law on this profession—and that she has assisted at ordination, both herself and Mrs. Hanaford taking prominent part, even to the laying on of hands.

In this city at the present time, women delegates are attending a Unitarian convention, and taking active part in its proceedings. Last year twenty-two Unitarian societies sent women delegates to its annual convention.

During the war women officiated as chaplains in the army, and Congress, by especial Act, provided for the payment of at least one such minister.

In August, 1869, the First Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia took the gospel step of ordaining women as deacons, and five such were duly authorized for the work. Now churches in various parts of the country have accepted their services, and it is the testimony of Henry Ward Beecher that one Deaconess is worth about two ordinary Deacons, which is either saying a good deal for the women or very little for the men.

One of the great revivalists of the day is a woman, a member of the Methodist body, who baptizes her converts, and receives them on probation in the regular ministerial way. More than twenty women are now studying Theology in the United States, and in minor Christian work women fill a wide public space, nor is this advance confined to one or two religious bodies. The Universalists, Unitarians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Christians, Methodists, are not alone. The Episcopal Diocese of Kansas within the year has placed two women on the examining board of the Diocesan Seminary, and the Jews permitting women to take part in the service of the Synagogue.

I must not fail to mention that Young Women's Christian Associations, and Women's Missionary Associations have been formed. That the Methodist Episcopal Church, instituted in 1869, has already over one hundred and thirty auxiliaries. Neither must I forget to mention that the Methodist have stricken the word "obey" out of their marriage service, a grand Christian step, and have also permitted women's votes on the question of lay delegation. The secretary of the Ladies' and Pastor's Union of that body, is a lady, now traveling in the interests of the Association in the West.

The Women's Centenary Meeting of the Universalists Church was recently held in Massachusetts, and addressed by several eloquent women pastors, of whom that denomination has nine or ten, and two 47 women are now on the Board of Directors of the Universalist Association.

At the recent meeting of the Board of Foreign Missions in New York, women addressed crowded houses and awakened deep interest. In ,Connecticut, a Women's Foreign Missionary Society was recently formed.

In some localities the management of Sunday Schools have almost fallen into women's hands, it being believe that mothers and sisters best know how to interest children. One of the most noted teachers of model lessons for Sunday School Conventions and Institutes, is a Chicago lady, who is also editor of one of the departments of the National Sunday School Teacher; and women in other parts of the country are acquiring an extended reputation in the same work.

Did I not wish to confine my remarks to our own country, I should like to refer to the change of religious views as regards women in India, and also in Persia where a new religion has arisen which gives women perfect equality.

Women have also entered the legal profession, and various States are admitting them to the bar. By an act of the Kansas Senate, in 1869, women were admitted to practice law in that State. Mrs. Mansfield, of Iowa, President of the Woman's Suffrage Association of that State, has been admitted to the bar. Missouri recently lost by death her first woman lawyer, Miss Lemme Barkaloo, a native of your neighboring city of Brooklyn. Her death was noticed by members of the St. Louis bar in resolutions, and the customary tributes of respect shown upon the decease of a member. These ceremonies wer taken part in by the best legal talent of that city. In Indiana, I believe, a woman has also been admitted to the bar; and in other States they but wait the action of the courts to take their place in the profession. One of these, Mrs. Bradwell, of Illinois, edits a legal paper of acknowledge ability and authority in the profession. One hundred women are now engaged in the study of law in the United States, and among them is a colored lady in the legal department of Howard University. It is but five or six years since the first colored male lawyer was admitted to practice in the Supreme Court, but such is the pressure of woman's demand, and such the advancement our reform is making, that a woman of his race is now close upon his path. Women legal students attending sessions of court have already exerted a refining influence on the speech and habits of masculine lawyers, and are destined to exert a marked effect on the legislation of the world.

The advanced opportunities of work for women my be mentioned by some other person, but a few of those which are somewhat dependent 48 upon certain educational institutions, legitimately fall to my mention. First among these are Schools of Design for women; that of Philadelphia, the oldest, founded by a woman, and that of New York also founded by a woman, but afterward incorporated into the Copper Institute School of Design. New England also possesses a School of Design for

women, founded later than the others. Anatomical instruction also forms part of the course in these schools.

Schools of Telegraphy for women also exist; the Western Union Telegraph Company, employing some forty girls in this city as an especial corps of Telegraphers, to whom instruction is given by competent women teachers. The Cooper Institute Free School of Telegraphy for women was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York and is under the management of an accomplished woman principal.

Industrial Schools, Agricultural and Horticultural Schools, where these latter pursuits are scientifically taught, have also been opened for women, and some women are now largely and successfully engaged in these employments; one lady, having extensive grounds, has erected, at an expense of \$10,000, large horticultural houses for the propagation of grapes.

Industrial schools, no less than the purely literary ones, attest the refined advance made in women's education within the last twenty years.

Were I to include other countries in my report I should trench too long upon the time of the Convention, but I can assure you the good work goes bravely on across the seas, and heathen as well as Christian countries are awakening to a sense of the injustice so long done our sex.

Thus far we have slightly traced the progress of woman's education within the past two decades, but there is no education as valuable as that of practical experience, and women further demand opportunity to use the educational advantages which lie in self-government. It is not our common schools, our colleges, nor our universities which have educated the men of this country. It is the ballot; it is a practical interest in the laws which govern them; it is the thought awakened by the responsibility of self-government.

The end of existence is growth; neither men nor women were created to bend to the accidents of society. The very fact of existence brings obligations with it, and must ultimately ensure the widest opportunities to each individual. If for no other reason than the cultivation of her powers, woman demands to share in the government of the country. She, equally with man, has an inherent right to all opportunity for the full development of her intellect. The education of the schools is but preparatory to the practical education which contact with the world brings. Statesmanship, with its broad humanitarian foundation, is peculiarly her right, and as the advance step in woman's education, fitly crowning the progress of the last twenty years, we demand for her the ballot; "the ballot, the nation's college," wide-spread in its benefits, and belonging of right to all citizens of the republic.

Twenty years ago woman's recognized sphere of work—the only occupation in which custom deemed it fit she should seek a livelihood—were house work, sewing and teaching. Three years ago the statistics of the New York City Working Woman's Protective Union named forty-three employments other than house-work, in which the women of that city alone were engaged. So wonderful has been the change in public sentiment within the last two decades in regard to men's sphere of work that we find much of the sewing of the world has fallen into men's hands. Not only has the sewing machine given occasion for men to enter this branch of old feminine work, but another masculine employment has grown up in the manufacture of models by which to cut women's clothing; and Worth, as chief dressmaker of the civilized world, stands in women's old work by the side of Blot, whose lessons in that chief housework duty, cookery, are still fresh in our minds.

No less great has been the change in the world's pre-conceived ideas of women's sphere of work, as shown by employments in which women now freely engage.

Not only are women entering Horticulture and Floriculture, as I have previously shown, but in direct farm work are they taking share, and proving themselves to be the most admirable cultivators of the soil.

Not only in our own country have we many instances of woman's successful management of farms, but from Europe we have like accounts.

The Royal Agricultural Society offered last year a hundred-guinea prize for the best managed farm in the central districts of England. Owing to the fact that farms there are mostly worked by tenants whose rents are equal the first cost of a farm in this country, it requires excellent management to bring about a paying result. Twenty-one farms, however, competed for the above prize, and one, managed by a woman, took it. The judges declared her farm to be an exceedingly good example of a well managed one, and ahead of all the others in point of productiveness, suitability of live stock, and *general cultivation with a view to profit*.

Nor is the superiorly managed farm a small one, it contains nearly nine hundred acres, and annually winters one thousand sheep and seventy head of cattle.

Quite a proportion of the farmers of England are women, and in 50 our own country is a growing inclination among women for farm work. The Chicago Evening Post reports twenty thousand women as having worked in the field during harvest last year, in the State of Wisconsin alone. The New York Farmers' club pays heed to these signs of the times, and not long ago interested itself to procure land near the city for a woman who wished to enter into the cultivation of small fruits. The question of work to-day being not so much *who* does it as *how* it is done. Not only in agriculture direct, but in

occupations bearing upon it, are women to be found. The Cattle Market Reports of New York city are daily made out for certain papers, by a lady of unquestioned ability for the work, whose opinion the Farmers' Club quotes, and stock dealers accept as recognized authority in all matters connected with cattle or horses.

A woman of Iowa stands at the head of the Bee interested in the United States. She edits the Bee column in several papers; at Bee conventions her opinion is eagerly sought on all questions which come up; and such is her superior judgement upon Bee culture that it has received recognition from the Government itself. One of her essays upon this subject was adopted by the Department of Agriculture and issued in its report of 1865, she receiving for it the handsome sum of three hundred dollars.

In the manufactures of the country, women are a large and rapidly increasing class. The census of 1860 reported their numbers as two hundred and eighty-five thousand, (285,000 and no enumeration was made of those employed in manufactures whose yearly product was less than five hundred dollars.

We also find women gaining their livelihood as stenographers, engravers, printers, telegraphers, photographers, cabinet-makers, black-smiths, engineers, doctors, druggists, dentists, oculists, merchants, clerks, book-keepers, pay-masters, barbers, real estate agents, insurance agents, market-women, hotel-keepers, captains of boats, leaders in orchestras, members of bands, lumber dealers, contractors distillers, managers of theatres, minstrels, and other amusements.

In occupations requiring the close management of money, we find them as bankers, brokers, and cashier, and since laws giving women the control of their own property have been adopted by some States, a vast amount of real estate has come into their possession. A newspaper, devoted to the investigation of facts bearing upon the ownership of land, refers with surprise to the immense number of women who buy and sell land, loan money on mortgages, and in other ways deal in such securities.

As exhibiting woman's business qualities, I may be permitted to say that the Women's Co-operative Association of California declared a dividend of 30 per cent profits upon its capital, within a few months after its formation.

In art-industry, women are fast acquiring an assured place. Seven of the American sculptors in Rome—one third of the whole number—are women. One of these ladies received \$10,000 in gold for her statue of Benton; another was commissioned by congress two years ago for a statue of Lincoln, and

the work already awaits the judgement of posterity; while a third is doubly worthy of remembrances, as her genius broke the bonds of race as well as sex.

In painting, Rosa Bonheur stands in the first rank, and at the Paris Exposition of the Industry of all Nations, the painting which drew all eyes, and received the chief prize, was a woman's work.

Literature is fast becoming a recognized means of livelihood, and although twenty years ago it was a common remark that women made their way into it by the compilation of cookery books; now women step at once into the most responsible posts, and as publishers, editors reporters and correspondents, exert a marked influence upon the thought of the day.

The lately issued Index of Harper's Magazine says, "the great number of female writers is worthy of note, and that of writers whose articles are deemed of such special value as to receive exceptional prices, there are more women than men."

In England, a woman holds to-day the foremost place in literature; in France it is a woman's writings which are the most eagerly sought, and which are exerting the most marked influence on the social wrongs of the age. The book which in our own country did so much to bring about a social and moral revolution, and which has been read on every continent of the globe, was also from a woman's pen.

Government has recognized woman's worth as a worker by placing her in various departments at Washington, and her service are now rendered in the general Post Office Department, the Treasury Department, and the Department of the Interior, and we have the testimony of the highest officials as to her capability and honest in these employments.

As teachers of a Nautical School, two women of New York, during the war, prepared over two thousand mates and captains for the rigid Government examination they were then obliged to undergo.

Women are also engaged in work belonging especially to a political sphere. Not only in Wyoming, where a woman justice has tried over forty cases, in all of which her judgement stands, but in States where she is a non-voter she has been appointed to paying positions, 52 and in Maine has also officiated as Justice of the Peace. In Montana she acts as Sheriff, in Iowa as Constable, in Kansas and Missouri as Engrossing Clerk, and Enrolling Clerk in the Legislature of those States; and in others as Notary Public, Town Clerks, Revenue Officers, Inspector and Commissioner of Schools. Post Offices innumerable are also under her charge; the scantily populated State of Texas even, boasting of forty-five, while some of the largest and most important offices in the Union are indebted to women for many improvements in their management.

More than this, a woman's branch of a National Police Agency has been in existence of fifteen years, which has not only manifested its efficacy, in the discovery of stolen property, but once, at least, within the last few years, in a way which had its bearing upon our existence as a nation.

At the breaking out of the war, this agency was transferred to Washington, and the woman at its head was placed in charge of the women's branch of the Secret War Service.

Before Lincoln took his seat as President, whispers were rife throughout the country of a plan to assassinate him while on his way to Washington. Such a plan did exist, and its spirits were some of the most daring of the rebellion. Baltimore, from the unusual facilities a transit through that city gave, was the place chosen for its execution; but quietly and silently a woman detective laid her counteracting plan, managing all its details so successfully, that Lincoln passed unrecognized through the city, and reached Washington in safety.

The world is woman's, and in it, she, too, must do what her hands find to be done.

At the evening session, Apollo Hall was packed with a highly intelligent and enthusiastic audience.

Adelle Hazlett, of Michigan, was the first speaker. On being introduced, she said:

Gentlemen and Ladies:— It seems scarcely fitting that I, so young in the cause of women's enfranchisement, should venture to speak on this occasion, and in presence of these veteran soldiers for the right.

Remembering, as I must, that the first of these gatherings was presided over by her who is our distinguished chairman to-night, and that she has given to this cause not only earnest sympathy and persevering labor, but a genius versatile and brilliant; that by her side was found then, as to-day, those two grand women, Mrs. Mott and Mrs. Stanton; that then, as now, the irrepressible Susan stood as a pillar of strength, against whom the waves of opposition and the storms of contention beat as against the granite rock—when I remember all this, and realize that 53 these older champions of liberty are all before you, I feel now pale must by my light beside these stars of the first magnitude.

But I am, after all, as much interested in the subject as they are; and so I venture to stand upon the platform at this decade meeting, and hail, with them, the gradual awakening of the women of this land to a consciousness of their lofty origin. the sacredness of their duties and the glory of their destiny.

Hitherto these indefatigable laborers have sought to inspire their country-women; in the future it is to be their country-women who will inspire them. Whatever they to-day think of feel, whatever yearning after liberty thrills their hearts, is but a feeble pulsation of a sentiment that beats warm and full in the hearts of the women of America. An educated, thinking people cannot and will not remain in slavery. And, too, such a people cannot choose but despise that which is not worthy of respect; and I ask, are men worthy of respect, who profess to be republican in sentiment, yet constitute themselves, each and all, despots in their own families, and fortify themselves in that position by laws framed in the name of liberty? Gentlemen, do you see the shoals upon which you are drifting? for, believe me, "the time cometh and now is," when he would be loved and respected by women must be just to women.

Point not exultingly to our frail bodies. The body is but clay, and though you hold that in subjection you gain nothing. The soul—the fine spirit—escapes you. The *real* woman is beyond your power—calm, self-poised, and triumphant. Would you grasp a shadow for a substance? Where is your so-called free republic? Where your boasted equality? How protect you domestic happiness? You say it is founded upon love. Very well, can love exist without respect? Is respect born of injustice? Does justice consist in holding one human being subject to another? Alas! we have neither home, country or freedom, for nothing is ours truly which is not ours to hold and defend. It is a duty which you owe to yourselves to look this matter fairly in the face, remembering that the better part of valor is discretion. These old agitators and *aggravators* must soon pass off the stage of action, but from their dust will spring another band of laborers that will remind you of a couplet in the story of Jack, the Giant-Killer: "Though he be dead, there comes another, Still more dreadful than his brother."

The woman question is the ghost that will not down in American politics. What part have we in the Constitution? It ranks us with criminals and paupers. What to us in the country's flag? It floats not over one free woman. If fortune had made slaves of us all, you and us, 54 we could have borne it, but that our own husbands and brothers should hold us in subjection to themselves, this, this is too much for our quivering heart-strings! Of what worth is love encrusted with selfishness? Men require unselfish love, purity and truth in woman. Have we not an equal right to demand these attributes in men?

It is said we are supported and should be content. Nine-tenths of the American women support themselves. But if men claim that they support us, let all women cease to labor. Let all the factory women, all the sewing women, the wives of farmers, mechanics, day-laborers, seat themselves at their ease, leaving all the so-called woman's work to be done by men, that they may earn the title of supporters. Nonsense, say you, and so say I. And now, since women must labor, I ask for her equal educational advantages and fair and open business field. Who says she will forsake her "sphere?" Are

any of God's creatures given to sphere forsaking? Do fish fly in the air? Do birds seek a home in the deep? Do beasts walk erect like men and perform men's duties? Do men transform themselves into beasts—but I will stop there lest I weaken my argument.

It is the sphere of beasts, birds and fishes to do anything which their nature prompts, and men claim the same thing for themselves. And when God did all else so well shall we suppose he failed in his last and crowning work? Made an imperfect, unruly being, beyond his management, and so was compelled to call in man as an assistant, lest this wild creature scale the barriers and forsake her sphere? Gentlemen, you put a bird in a cage, give it food and drink and expect it to repay your cruel kindness with a song as sweet as though trilled amid the green leaves of its native wild-wood. But do you succeed in changing its nature? Do the wings cease to grow because unused? Does not your prisoner dart out of his cage at the first opportunity and leave you? But the robin you have not harmed sits in the branches by your window, chirps a song for you ear and eats the crumbs you drop upon your window-sill. You can no more change the nature of a woman than that of a bird, and while you hold her a captive the song you covet will be bereft of its sweetness. If she is not contented in her present position, it is proof positive that she is not in her proper sphere.

It is a shame to this Republic, and the men of this Republic, that I, or any other woman, should stand upon a public platform and plead and supplicate for our right of the franchise.

When Kossuth came to this country the whole heart of America shouted anthems of welcome. Greece was in distress, American sympathized. Then came a cry for help from the classic shore of distant Crete. That cry was echoed and re-echoed from ocean to ocean. The 55 electric cry of "*Vive la Republic*" came like music waves across the Atlantic, and America's enthusiasm was unbounded.

The men of this Republic thus declare themselves the champions of liberty. But what of one half of America's own citizens? Bow your heads, oh ye law-makers, and blush for shame that ye place the crown of citizenship upon the brows of men, who are the off-shoots, the dregs, the scum of European Dynasties; yet practically say your own wives and daughters are not worthy to wear it! They have helped you to conquer independence, to protect if from rebellion and treason, and this is their reward.

But while I contend that men are doing women a great wrong, I am willing to believe they will do her justice yet. I will not have the impertinent arrogance to say that the equality which they declare the centre and starting-point of all their national policies is but an idle joke upon the most sacred interest of humanity. No, gentlemen, I will accept your republican sentiments as real, and in behalf of women will claim the natural, logical, unavoidable consequence of your freely chosen government

policy; a right to shape her own destiny, a right untrammelled as an American citizen to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Your last Congress said that any citizen who is liable to taxation or punishment for crime is entitled to the ballot, and therefore the negro should vote. Will you be as just to us as to the negro? * *

Remember that the logic of politics is absolute; that either the government of the one is best or the government of the *all* is best; we must go back to the government of the one or advance to the government of the *all*. To doubt Universal Suffrage is to doubt Democracy. Equality denied, this nation *will die, and ought to die*. It must have no *law-made* cause of contention. And, gentlemen, one reason why I wish the suffrage for women is because it will be for your interest to grant it. The mass of women now expend their time and your money in frivolous amusements and extravagant dress. The treasure that is squandered upon useless finery, and which finds its way into foreign coffers, would in a few years pay the National Debt. And more men are ruined financially, through the unwise expenditures of wives and daughters than by all other means combined. Make woman a responsible citizen; make her your business partner, secure thus her interest in your own, business and its success, as well as in the financial condition of the country, and at the same time remove the temptation to dress extravagantly by relieving her of the necessity of marrying for a home. Do this, and witness the advent of a new type of womanhood, women worthy to be the wives and mothers of freemen, women worthy to be loved, fought for, *died for*.

56

America was not made to be a prison for any class, nor for our husbands more than for ourselves, and until this principle is acknowledged there is no earthly power that can knit a lasting tie between the ruler and the ruled. Men and women to-day, even while bound together by golden links of love and friendship, seem to regard each other as in some sort natural antagonists. Women berate and slander men as a class, men berate and slander women as a class. The newspapers are filled with flings and poor jokes at the expense of women.

This state of things interferes with legal justice. It lowers the value of womanhood in the eyes of judge and jury. It is alleged that women have the advantage in courts of law. In isolated instances and peculiar circumstances it may be true, but in the aggregate is untrue. A few days ago, in this city, a woman was held to bail in \$2,000 bonds for stealing \$21.00. On the same day, in the same court, a man was held to bail in \$500 bonds for murdering his child, and nearly murdering his wife. Thus it is practically said that it is four times as great a crime in a woman to steal \$21.00 as in a man to commit a double murder. Nearly every crime is worse punished when committed by a woman, unless the woman has influential male relations to befriend her.

A *man* commits a horrible murder, pleads insanity—McFarland like—and is cleared by law and turned loose upon society; and his insanity is no obstacle to citizenship. A woman—had she escaped the gallows—would have been lodged in a mad-house.

Thousands of women secure food and shelter by unholy means. This fact is trumpeted abroad, flung in the face of virtuous women as proof of the natural depravity of the sex, and with taunting doubts as to the trustworthiness of any. But where are their partners in the guilt? Mingling unblushingly in “refined society;” crowding round the polls to make laws for the government of women; denouncing woman-suffrage on the ground that the vote of unworthy women would lower the value and dignity of the ballot.

Yet we are expected to smile while our sex is degraded; to have no desire for a ballot to hurl against this false social system; or at least, we are advised to be moderate in our demands, to have a care not to excite the anger of men, to play upon their vanity; to say to Congress and State Legislatures, “We humbly pray your honorable body.” And we have done this; we have prayed, we have expostulated. Our petitions have been greeted with contemptuous smiles; they are not respected; they are pearls cast before—“honorable bodies.”

I will never sign a petition for suffrage; I will not so humbly pray for what is mine by right. And thousands of women feel as I feel in regard to this. Were it not so, Congress would be fairly inundated 57 with petitions. What, then, I am asked, is to be done? We cannot take the ballot by physical force. Neither could the negro. The advancing principles of American civilization liberated the negro. We must educate the masses—create a just popular sentiment. Thus can we best hasten the end in view.

I believe that God has decreed that women shall be free, and what he decrees will be accomplished. He fights the battles of the weak. I rest my cause with him, and am safer with him, if that cause be just, than with all the soldiers America can muster. He raised up for the American Colonies foreign help against England. He created a military necessity which emancipated the negro, and a political necessity which gave him the ballot. It matters not whether woman fight or not, her battles will be fought. This question is to be adopted freely by an educated, reasoning people, or it is to be prayed for and fought for. Will the men of this nation be just to-day, or will they wait till heaven made circumstances shall wrest justice from them? Humanity moves onward toward the goal of freedom. What nation shall reach it first? Will it be America? Not if America neglect to recognize and act upon that principle of universal liberty which is at once its pride and glory, for, believe me, when the song of thanksgiving arises to God from the liberated millions, woman's voice will not fail.

I beseech you, my countrymen, let not another nation secure the crown America should wear. Have something better to give this cause than the respectful hearing and the generous applause with which you have honored me, and for which I thank you; give a brother's voice, a brother's hand in our behalf. When we kneel—as I feel we yet shall—beneath the stars and stripes, to thank God that we have at last a flag, a country and a home, let our happiness have the crowning joy of knowing that it was the greatness and justness of the men of America that placed the standard in our hands, and said to the world: "Henceforth our wives and daughters shall help us to hold this ensign steady." Let us say, our husbands spoke, they acted and we are free. And at this act of theirs, tyrants will tremble, for it will be a proclamation to the world that the time has come when men are expected to do right from principle, and not because might enforces it.

Found this nation on a rock—on truth, nature and the whole people, on universal culture and political freedom. Close the last gate of barbarism, and listen to the triumphant shout of humanity as it is heard creaking on its hinges. Sweep caste and class legislation from this beautiful land, and show to the watching world how out of free church, free schools, free assembly, and the EQUALITY OF EVERY CITIZEN, institutions, federations and empires are made.

MRS. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON'S ADDRESS AT THE DECADE MEETING, ON MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

60

At the close of Mrs. Hazlett's address Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton was introduced. As her speech is very voluminous we are compelled to abridge it by omitting the bible argument and the abstract of the marriage and divorce laws of the State of New York, and the comments thereon. She commenced by saying:

I am invited this evening to speak on the important questions of "Marriage and Divorce."

The political phase of the woman's rights movement has been so thoroughly discussed in England and this country, and has already realized so many practical results that it looks as if the suffrage battle was nearly fought and won. It has long been the opinion of the best constitutional lawyers that women have the right to vote under the constitution. Women have already voted in Wyoming, Utah, and other places under this verdict; there remains no question but that of time for the usage to become general. Hence those who feel a deeper interest in the more vital questions of this reform—the social problems—should now give their earnest thought and speech in such directions.

We are in the midst of a social revolution, greater than any political or religious revolution that the world has ever seen, because it goes deep down to the very foundations of society.

We are not called on in republican America to-day to decide whether the Pope is infallible, or whether the King can do no wrong, for Italy has settled one and France the other for this generation.

But a question of greater magnitude presses on our consideration, whether man and woman are equal, joint heirs to all the richness and joy of earth and heaven, or whether one was eternally ordained to be the subject of the other. The political and religious status of the Pope and King are easily decided as compared with this, for those unite the opinions of the many against the one, but here is a question with half the human family, and that the strongest half, on one side, who are in possession of the citadel, hold the key of the treasury, and make the laws and public sentiment to suit their own purposes. Can all this be made to change base without prolonged discussion, upheavings, heart-burnings, violence and war? Will man yield what he conceives to be his legitimate authority over woman with less struggle than have Popes and Kings their supposed rights over this subjects, or slave-holders over their slaves? No, no. John Stuart Mill says the generality of the male sex cannot yet tolerate the idea of living with an *equal* at the fireside, and here is the secret of the opposition to woman's equality in the State and the Church; men are not ready to recognize it in the home. This is the real danger apprehended in giving woman the ballot, for as long as man makes, interprets and executes the laws for himself, he holds this whole matter pretty much in his own power under any system. Hence when he expresses the fear that liberty to woman would upset the family relation, he acknowledges that her present condition of subjection is not of her own choosing, and that if she had the power the whole relation would be essentially changed. And this is just what is coming to pass, the kernel of the struggle we witness to-day. This is woman's transition period, from slavery to freedom, and all the social upheavings, before which the wisest and bravest stand appalled, are but necessary incidents in her progress to equality.

Conservatism cries out we are going to destroy the family. Timid reformers answer, the political equality of woman will not change it. They are both wrong. It will entirely revolutionize it. When woman is man's equal the marriage relation cannot stand on the basis it is on today. But this change will not destroy it. As human statutes and state constitutions did not create conjugal and maternal love, they cannot annul them. We can trust the laws of the universe, even if the speeches and resolutions of a woman's rights convention seem to conflict with them. Is family life with the mass of mankind to-day so happy and satisfactory that it needs no improvement? Change is not death, neither is progress destruction. We have shifted governments from despotisms and monarchies to republics without giving up the idea of national life, and we Americans firmly believe that more peace and prosperity can be realized in a true republic than under any other form of government.

True, such changes from the lower to the higher have involved debates, dissensions, violence, war; but the free institutions you and I enjoy to-day more than compensate for the sufferings of our fathers in the little May Flower, on that wintry sea, the dreary landing on Plymouth rock, the rigors of a New England winter and the hardships of a seven-years' war.

We have changed the foundations of the Church, too, without uprooting the religious sentiment in the human soul. The discussions and dissensions in the Church filled the world with despair for ages, and deluged nations in blood, but the Protestant right of individual conscience and judgment is the result, and though the cardinal points of our faith have been changed and changed again, yet we have a Church still.

So we shall have the family after the present idea of man's headship is repudiated and woman set free.

To establish a republican form of government the right of individual judgment in the family must of necessity invokediscussion, dissension, division; but the purer, higher, holier marriage will be evolved by the very evils we now see and deplore.

This same law of equality that has revolutionized the State and the 62 Church is now knocking at the door of our homes, and sooner or later there too it must do its work.

Let us one and all wisely bring ourselves into line with this great law, for man will gain as much as woman by an equal companionship in the nearest and holiest relations of life.

How to marry is the primal question to what justifies divorce, and to know how to do the first wisely would, in most cases, obviate the necessity of the other at all. It is not my mission to patch up evils, for my mind always gravitates to the foundation causes of the discord and disorder on the surface. I would rather be instrumental in placing one new round in the ladder of progress by which all humanity might rise a little higher, than with moral anodynes to soothe the sufferings of one generation in their false relations.

We are doing two things to-day in the Western States to improve married life. In opening all high-schools and colleges to girls, we are giving young men and women better opportunities of studying each other's tastes, sentiments, capacities, characters, in the normal condition. In every-day life, in the recitation-room and on the play-ground, the real character reveals itself, and more congenial marriages will be the result of these early and free acquaintanceships, far different from those under the artificial stimulus of fashionable society. Thus, too, in rousing a girl's ambition to go through a collegiate course, marriage will be postponed to later years, when her character and physical powers

will be matured and perfected. This of itself will end much of the weakness and disability that so greatly mar the happiness of married life to-day.

Whatever can be done to give women health and happiness, vigor and freedom to body and mind, will bring solace and sunshine into home-life. Napoleon once said "You cannot make a soldier out of a sick man." You cannot make happy mothers out of sick women, and so long as our homes are hospitals dark shadows hang over the best part of our lives. Still another great result will flow from this new system of education. Boys and girls studying side by side, contending for the same prizes, will learn to regard each other as equals, which will do much to change the man's overweening self-conceit into profound respect for woman; and again, when both, in the cultivation of their spiritual and intellectual powers, shall learn the higher pleasure of a mutual flow and interflow of brain forces, galvanizing both into grander thought and nobler aspirations, the mere sensuous will take its subordinate place, and marriage will have new attractions, based not on the physical alone, but the higher sentiments, and thus be purified and exalted.

Moreover girls are beginning to have the idea of pecuniary independence, of the dignity of self-support; hence, with their minds occupied 63 in study, their hands in profitable work, marriage will cease to be the only goal of their ambition, it will be an incident in their lives, not the whole of it.

When womanhood is as dignified and independent as manhood, in and of itself, and labor equally honorable for both, woman will not marry to escape the odium of being called old maids, or to live by the bounty of another.

Let us remember that womanhood is the great fact, wifehood and motherhood its incidents. A place in the world of work in the trades and professions will enable women to marry from the highest motives, not from their necessities; it will teach them, too, the value of money—to earn what they spend will be the best possible check to extravagance, and end much of the domestic contention over the almighty dollar—and this place she is slowly conquering to-day. Let every wise father educate his daughter to self-support, if he would make her life happy and independent.

If girls had occupation, kid fathers and mothers would not be so often called to deplore the unfortunate marriages so many of their daughters make. If they were kept in colleges as their brothers are until twenty-five, studying science and philosophy, they would not commence the study of man at sixteen.

Let the intellect and ambition have full play, and the sentiments and affections will not be so easily roused. Alas! what wrecks we see on every side of girls married in their teens to young men who drink and smoke and chew and gamble, spending their days in idleness and their nights in

vice, propagating discord, disease and crime in all our homes. We meet these victims of unhappy marriages everywhere.

Traveling, not long since, I noticed in the seat near me a sweet, girlish looking woman, dressed in deep black. She looked so sad and lonely that I went to her and proposed a walk on the platform while the cars were stopping. We were soon friends, and she gave me her sorrowful experiences. Married at sixteen to a young man of wealth, education and good family, but of intemperate habits, which she thought his affection for her would enable her to control; the mother of three sons before she was twenty, all sickly, nervous, restless; her own health broken down with anxiety, and watching not only the children, night after night, but the father; friends, thinking it best to get him out of New York from the many temptations of a city, with active business in the country, sent him to the oil regions in Pennsylvania, and there this delicate, pure, refined young child spent six years of her life trying to win a besotted man to the paths of virtue and peace. Night after night, when the babies were asleep, she would go alone through sleet, 64 and rain, and snow, all round one of those rough pioneer settlements, into every den of vice, looking for the father of her children that she might get him home. "One thing," said she, "he would always do—lay down his cards and glass and follow me, but on our way home he would say: 'Mary, such places are not fit for you.' 'Then,' I replied, 'a man who frequents such places is not a fit companion for me.' But these," said she "were six long years of useless struggle. He became cross and irritable, loathsome, bloated, disgusting, turned my love to hate, and after a fearful attack of delirium tremens, the grave covered my shame and misfortunes, and my three children lie by his side. And when, with aching heart, I buried them all there, you may wonder to hear me say so, but it was with a sorrowful thankfulness, for I remembered that warning in the second commandment, given mid the thunders of Sinai: 'The sins of the fathers shall visited upon the children.' Now, said I, I shall be saved the unspeakable sorrow of ever seeing my own sons come reeling home to me with that silly, sensual leer that is worse than abuse and profanity." What a chapter of experience for a girl not twenty-five! And multitudes are following in her wake!!

When women are scientifically educated, when they understand all the responsibilities that parenthood involves, and the long train of evils that flow from blunders in these primal relations, drunkards, gamblers, tobacco chewers and debauchees will be at a discount. Let no girl marry a sensual man to reclaim him; there are stains on such a soul that no love can wash away. Science has vindicated the right to discuss freely whether our ancestors were apes; let it be as free to ask whether our posterity shall be idiots, dwarfs, knaves and lunatics; and if not, by what changes, if any, in our social institutions, such wretched results may be avoided.

So long as people marry from considerations of policy—from every possible motive but the true one—discord and division must be the result. So long as the State provides no education for youth

on these questions, and throws no safeguards around the formation of marriage ties, it is in honor bound to open wide the door of escape. From a woman's stand-point I see that marriage, as an individual tie, is slavery for woman, because law, religion and public sentiment all combine, under this idea, to hold her true to this relation, whatever it may be, and there is no other human slavery that knows such depths of degradation as a wife chained to a man whom she neither loves nor respects no other slavery so disastrous in its consequence on the race, or to individual respect, growth and development.

The question to-day with the Protestant world is not whether marriage is an indissoluble tie, a holy sacrament, but, as a civil contract, for 65 how many and what reasons it may be dissolved. In the beginning sacred and profane history alike show that this relation had not even the dignity of a contract; the whole matter rested in the hand of the individual man, who took or put away his wife at his pleasure, where it remained, for centuries alike under the Mosaic and Christian dispensation, until by a Papal act of encroachment, the power and arbitrament of divorce were rested from the master of the family, and marriage became a sacrament of the Church. "The Popes of Rome," says John Milton, "perceiving the great revenue and high authority it would give them, even over princes, to have the judging and deciding of such a main consequence in the life of a man as divorce, wrought so upon the superstitions of those ages, as to divest them of that right which God from the beginning had intrusted to the husband, by which means they subjected that ancient and naturally domestic prerogative to an external and unbefitting judicature."

The State, too, for certain civil reasons, claiming the regulation of property by inheritance, and the ownership of children, began in time to regulate marriage and divorce by legislation, differing, however, in all countries in many provisions, but invariably with reference to the supposed selfish interest of man; polygamy being the universal rule. We have no record of monogamic marriage as a system until it was established in pagan Rome 700 years before Christ, when it was more strictly observed than it has ever been since. At that early period civil law did not attempt to regulate marriage, as this was done by family councils, and this may account for the equivocal assertion we so often hear that there were no divorces in Rome the first five centuries of her national history. As divorce was unknown to their civil law, of course there could be none. Then for the first time the nuptial ceremonies were solemnized by the infusion of the religious element and the presence of the priests.

It was not considered a duty to employ priests at marriages until about 170 years after Christ. When Jesus and his disciples attended the marriage at Cana of Gallilee neither he nor his disciples took any part in the ceremonies. The next step in connecting religion with marriage was the custom of performing the ceremony at the church door. This custom continued in England to the time of

Edward VI. Edward I. was married at the door of Canterbury Cathedral to the sister of the king of France.

Marriage was first celebrated in the churches in the thirteenth century by the decree of Pope Innocent III. Thus a custom originating in paganism became a sacrament in the Church, designed specially no doubt to impress woman with the sanctity of the marriage relation *so far 66 as she was concerned*, and to secure, on her part at least, fidelity to the marriage vow.

Thus has the religious element in woman, as in all oppressed classes, been invariably played upon for her more complete subjugation. But for these false teachings of the church, multitudes of women through the centuries, would have risen up in their native purity and dignity and sundered with their own hands the unholy ties that bound them to disease, vice and crime, in unclean marriage relations; and those anti-Christian canons, long since obtruded upon the church of Rome, have not yet been scoured off by the Reformation.

But it was a maxim of Roman law, long after the Emperors became Christian, that no obstacle should be put in the way of divorce by the mutual consent or agreement of the parties, and that the parties should not be forced for fear of penalty to remain together when agreed to to separate, any more than they should be forced into marriage at first. Paulus Emelius, the greatest and worthiest Roman of his time, being asked why he put away his wife for no visible reason, replied, "This shoe," holding out his foot, "it a neat shoe, a new shoe, and seemingly fits me well, yet none of you know where it wrings me; much less can you discern the private differences of husband and wife, neither should you."

Without pursuing the history of marriage in different ages and latitudes, under different religions and forms of government, let us see how it is viewed by Protestants in our own country, judging from their codes and canons. A new feature in the constitution of marriage in our day is the growing recognition of woman as a party to the contract, having an equal right with man to take and put away. Governor Jewell, of Connecticut, told me that when he was Governor, in one year there were a third as many divorces in that State as marriages, and that the majority of the applications were made by women. It is this new element that embitters the discussion, for what is considered a legitimate love of freedom, in man, is rank rebellion in woman; and yet the tendency in both church and state is to secure to her greater latitude than she ever enjoyed before. The Methodist Church, by an ecclesiastical act, has taken the word "obey" from her marriage ceremony, and the leading clergymen in all denominations except the Episcopalian omit it at pleasure, thus taking one step toward recognizing the equality of the relation. The Presbyterian Church, in its confession of faith, grants divorce for two causes—adultery and desertion—thus making marriage a dissoluble tie.

By the laws of the several States, in this Republic, made by Christian representatives of the people, divorces are granted to-day for the 67 seventeen following reasons: "Bigamy," "Adultery," "Voluntary desertion from one to five years," "Continual absence for five years," "Imbecility or mental alienation," "A state of vagrancy," "Cruelty or abuse," "Refusing conjugal benevolence," "Habitual drunkenness and excessive use of opium." "Imprisonment for crimes decided by local statute," "Impotence of either party," "For not furnishing the wife with sufficient means of support," "Immorality of either party," the wife's refusal to follow her husband when he remove his home," "When either one belongs to the sect of Shakers," "Union with a negro, mulatto or Indian," Kentucky has gone so far as to make a law that when a husband announces in the papers his intention of not paying the debts of his wife, she has a sufficient cause for divorce, and all these causes are for divorce *a vinculo*, or absolute, not simple separation, or divorce *a mensa et thoro*. In regard to "cruelty and abuse," the Supreme Court Judges of both Michigan and Illinois have decided that this comprehends more than simply physical cruelty, such as kicking, pummelling, pinching; it includes those humiliations of the spirit occasioned by indifference, contempt and aversion. None of the Christian gentlemen who made these laws, or the learned judges who have given their decision, would admit that they had done aught to impair the sacredness of the marriage relation, but everything to protect it. Marital obligations, are nowhere so little regulated as in those countries where marriage is held to be a religious ordinance, and divorce wholly forbidden. Not to go out of our own country, contrast the condition of society in Indiana, where liberal divorce laws prevail, with South Carolina, where divorce is impossible, and while the later boasts of her virtue in this respect, she directs by special legislative enactment what proportion of a man's property he may give his concubine. "Forced virtue," says Milton, "is like a bolt overshot, it goes neither forward nor back, and does no good where it stands."

In the legislatures of New York and Missouri, where the divorce laws are not stringent, propositions have been under consideration to license prostitution by the State. In England, where they are equally strict, a contagious disease act has just been passed by the British Parliament. By this kind of legislation in the several States, we have practically decided two important points.

First, That marriage is not an indissoluble tie, but may be sundered by a decree of the courts—

Second, That marriage is not a sacrament of the church, but a civil contract between the parties. And the one involves the other.

Our laws are based on the old common law of England, which so regards it. Hence, as the State cannot take cognizance of the ideal or inner marriage, she deals with it simply as a question of public policy. 68 Whether her legislation to-day is marked with prudence and wisdom, is not only the

right, but the duty of every citizen to examine and consider. In the first place let us see if the State has hedged about *this contract*, so momentous and far-reaching in its consequences, with superior safeguards to all others of minor importance. A legal contract for a section of land requires: that the parties be of age; of sound mind; that there be no flaw in the title; no liens or mortgages thereon, not specified; that the agreement be in writing, with the names of the practice and witnesses duly affixed, stamped with the seal of the State, and recorded in the office of the County Clerk. In many States of the Union a legal marriage may be contracted between a boy of fourteen and a girl of twelve, without the consent of parents or guardians, without publication of banns, without witnesses, in any place known or unknown; the ceremony may be performed by any imposter, without even the signatures of the parties, the presence of a priest, country justice or any officer of the State.

Such absence of all form and dignity in the marriage contract is unknown in any other civilized nation. Though we are taught to regard France, of all European nations, most lax in social morals, yet her legislation on marriage, as a civil contract, is far more stringent than ours. By French law the husband must be eighteen, the wife fifteen. The consent of the parents or guardians of both parties is required. In case of their refusal the contract cannot be made until the man is twenty-five, the woman twenty-one. The marriage must be preceded by the publication of the banns, the ceremony performed by a public official at his office in the presence of four witnesses. It is moreover recorded in two special registers, one of which is deposited in the archives of the State.

Again, in any other civil contract, the failure of either party to comply with the conditions vitiates the contract, and it is annulled by the mutual agreement of both parties. But in the marriage contract which the State allows to be formed so thoughtlessly, ignorantly, irreverently, the parties, have no control whatever, though oftentimes in its formation and continuance all laws of decency and common sense are set at defiance; as forced marriages, mock marriages, suits for breach of promise, and divorce cases, all illustrate.

In a case of breach of promise it is not necessary, said a judge to a jury in the State of New York, that a promise of marriage should be made in express terms; frequent visits, conversation aside, expressions of attachment, some presents offered, walks taken together, &c, are sufficient circumstances on which to rely in proving the existence of a marriage engagement, and if the evidence is such as to convince the 69 judge, the law does not require anything to prove the tie. In Chicago, quite recently, a jury brought in a verdict against a man of a wealth, of \$100,000, in a case of breach of promise, where there was really no claims whatever on the part of the plaintiff. The victim of this swindle would not submit to the decision, but made appeal and was released in the higher courts. This has come to be a trade among an unprincipled order of women who seek

by artifices more or less ingenious to attract men of wealth, and when they accumulate sufficient evidence of attention they drop the mask and demand marriage or indemnity. Some to escape this Machiavelian pressure yield, and large sums of money are paid. Sometimes, of the man is single and cannot stand the financial pressure, he is forced into marriage. The New York World says: "The law of flirtation, as recently laid down by certain judges, is of a nature to give pause to the frolicsome and sentimental tendencies of the time." Chief Justice Parker, of Massachusetts, announces the opinion of the Supreme Court of that State, that an engagement "may be proved by those circumstances which usually accompany such a connection;" and the Kentucky Court of Appeals has declared that the mutuality of an engagement may be proved against a young lady "by showing that she demeaned herself as if she concurred in or approved the young man's promises or offers." It is not necessary that there should be an express promise on either side; for the learned and voluminous Mr. Chitty, in his work on contracts, says an engagement may be evinced by the unequivocal conduct of the parties, and by a general yet definite reciprocal understanding between them, their friends and relations, evidenced and corroborated by their actions. Young men and maidens are therefore hereby cautioned as to their understandings and actions if they would keep free from a rigid application of the laws of evidence for such cases made and provided."

In 1857, two young girls under fifteen, in New York and Boston, eloped with their fathers' coachmen and were legally married, without the consent of their parents. To obtain a divorce they were obliged to go through certain forms of law in other States. In jest one evening a young lady in the State of Pennsylvania was married to a Mr. B., by the pastor in the neighborhood. When the knot was tied the husband saw fit to take the mock-marriage in earnest, but the girl recovering her presence of mind refused to view it in that light, and to obtain her freedom was obliged to get a divorce before she could be released from the legal consequences of that thoughtless act.

What person of common sense or conscience can endorse laws as wise or prudent that sanction such acts as these. Let the State be logical; if marriage is a civil contract it should be subject to the laws of all 70 other contracts, carefully made, the parties of age, and all agreements faithfully observed; but if the immoral acts of either party, or insurmountable differences of organization essentially annul the contract, let the State declare it so. We need a national law or no law on this question. It is all-important for many reasons that our legislation in the several States should be homogeneous, that the civil status of the citizen may be the same in Connecticut and New York. By the laws of these States to day, a man or woman who could be legally married in Connecticut might be convicted of bigamy in New York.

This dodging from one State to another, so common to-day, to secure freedom, is educating our people into contempt for all law. My idea of true reform is not to coquet with unjust law, thrust it one

side or try to get beyond its reach, but to fight it where it is and fight it to the death; for so long as the right of divorce is denied in a single State in this Union, it is made disreputable in all. The result of this fragmentary vacillating legislation is three kinds of polygamy in our midst.

First. There is the Mohammedan or Mormon form of polygamy, many wives known to each, living in daily contact.

Second. There is the form known to our laws as bigamy, where one man has two or more wives living in different places, each supposing herself the legal wife.

Third. There is the form well known to society, which our legislators now propose to license, where a man lives with one wife, whose children are his legal heirs, but who has many mistresses. This is everywhere practiced in the United States, and yet, under our social, religious and political institutions, the best type of civilization is realized that the race has attained.

To sum up the dark facts of our social life gives one a gloomy picture. The social vice, with its festering, wide-spread corruption, disease and death of soul and body alike, filling our asylums with the deaf, the dumb, the blind, the maimed, the halt, the idiot, the lunatic; incest in high places, seduction, rape, infanticide, lily hands strangling the moral monstrosities of an unwilling maternity, wives running to Indiana and Connecticut like slaves to their Canada, from marriages worse than plantation slavery; paramours shot in broad day light, our courts of justice and leading journals made the hunting-ground of Christian women who dare to sound the tocsin of alarm, who dare to call public thought to the social relation of the sexes, relations that underlie all religion and government.

Before these awful facts of life we stand hardened or appalled. The recent acts in the British Parliament licensing houses of prostitution 71 roused the indignation of the entire womanhood of England, while similar propositions in this country scare create a ripple on the surface. It is, however, a sign of awaking to these all-important questions that so large an audience has gathered here to-night.

Let us now glance at a few of the popular objections to liberal divorce laws.

First. "It is said that to make divorce respectable by law, gospel and public sentiment, is to break up all family relations;" which is to say that human affections are the result and not the foundation of the canons of the Church and statutes of the State. The love of men and women for their children and one another existed long before human governments were established. Crippled, perverted and enslaved, it has outlived despotisms, monarchies and republics, and will no doubt survive when all

forms of government have passed away, for love is immortal. I had never supposed that the regret I felt in leaving home, husband and children, and the joy in returning, were the result of the stringent divorce laws in the State of New York, and that but for them, I should have been a wanderer on the face of the earth. To open the door escape to those who dwell in continual antagonism, to the unhappy wives of drunkards, libertines, knaves and tyrants, need not necessarily embitter the relations of those who are contented and happy; but on the contrary, the very fact of freedom strengthens and purifies the bond of union. When husbands and wives do not own each other as property, but are bound together only by affection, marriage will be a life-long friendship, and not a heavy yoke from which both may sometimes long for deliverance.

The freer the relations between human beings, the happier. Look, for example, at the servants in our households; with how much more care and consideration we treat them, knowing that they can leave us when they choose, than we should if they were our slaves absolutely in our power, that if they left us, gospel and public sentiment would drive them back. The necessity on our part of greater kindness and generosity to hold them, while it ensures greater happiness to them, is the most desirable discipline for ourselves. Many a man who is tyrannical to-day, if he knew public sentiment would protect his wife in leaving him, would become kind and considerate; and many a wife who is peevish and fretful, a continual torment and annoyance, if she knew her husband could sunder the tie honorably and reputably, would soon change her manners.

Second. "It is said that the 10,000 libertines, lechers and egotists would take a new wife every Christmas if they could legally and reputably rid themselves in season of the old one." This is one of 72 Horace Greeley's objections. This objection is based on the idea that woman will always remain the penniless, helpless, resistless victim of every man she meets, that she is to-day. But in the new *regime*, when she holds her place in the world of work, educated to self-support, with land under her feet and a shelter over her head, the results of her own toil, the social, civil, political equal of the man by her side, she will not clutch at every offer of marriage, like the drowning man at the floating straw. Though men should remain just what they are to-day, the entire revolution in woman's position, now inaugurated, forces a new moral code in social life. Again, the class of men who would do these things under liberal divorce laws, do them now, and they are enabled to tyrannize over the legal wives, the innocent victims who respect law and public sentiment, as they could not, if women were educated into higher ideas of duty, purity and virtue, as in time they would be under just and liberal laws.

Third. It is objected that under liberal divorce laws, the fickle and restless would separate for trifling causes, and the sensuous for mere love of change.

As the centripetal forces in the material world are strong enough to hold matter to a common centre, against all other laws and attractions, so in the moral world, the love of change is subordinated to the stronger love of the familiar objects and conditions about us. All experience proves the truth of the historical maxim, that mankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they have been accustomed. The restless, the fickle, the sensuous, are not the classes that respect and obey law, they are the moral comets and meteors that mark out their own courses through life. What are the marriage and divorce laws of New York to the 20,000 prostitutes in her metropolis, and the married men who visit these haunts of vice, disease and death, or to those who can readily sever these ties in Indiana and Connecticut? It is only the virtuous and law-abiding that are interested in wise and humane legislation. As Moses permitted the children of Israel, so the State seems to permit the vicious classes, because of the hardness of their hearts, to be a law unto themselves. Why not permit the pure-minded, the educated, the refined to be a law unto themselves?

Fourth. People say though it may be better for unhappy husbands and wives to part, the best interests of the children require an indissoluble union.

The best interests of the children, the parents, the State all require that such ties should be religiously dissolved. It is a great thing to be well born, and no amount of love, care of education can ever compensate a child for the moral and physical weaknesses and deformities, the unhappy morbid conditions that result in its organization from coldness, indifference, aversion or disgust in the parents for one another. Next to the misfortune of such a birth is the demoralizing influence on children when trained in an atmosphere of discord and dissatisfaction, such as a false marriage relation inevitably creates. Moreover, a wise mother would be able to train her children far better alone, than subject to the abuse and interference of a vicious, besotted man; or, the reverse; for where the moral and intellectual natures of men and women are subject to the sensual, the caprices of temper or appetite outweigh all love for their children. It is sometimes the case, that two people, equally well organized, desire divorce, who, like oil, and water never seem to move in the same currents; if such separate, who shall have the children? In such cases a pleasant friendship would or might ensue where conjugal love was impossible, and they could agree, themselves, on some satisfactory disposition of their children. Those who believe in liberal divorce laws may, in turn, ask what becomes of the children of to-day. Let your jails, prisons, asylums, houses of refuge, answer the question. If the world cared more for the kind of children thrown on its charity and less for the statistics of numbers, our records of poverty, misery and crime would be far less appalling. One of the strongest reasons for demanding the release of unhappy wives and husbands from discordant marriages, is the evil results of such relations on children.

Fifth. It is objected that men and women would not exercise the deliberation and discrimination they now do, if to marry ill were not considered a crime and the parties not doomed to suffer a life-long penalty.

As I have already shown, nothing could be more reckless than our present system, when merely to be seen walking together may be taken as evidence of intent to marry and going through the ceremony in jest may seal the contract.

“Of all requirements,” says Robert Dale Owen, “the most arduous—arduous when even mature thought has brought wisdom and where age has conferred experience—is the decision whether a being loved now is the one of all others, intellectually, morally, physically, to whom in a true home we can impart happiness and from whom we are capable of receiving it. Mortal eyes, even the wisest, never fully penetrate the veil; there may be that beyond which no foresight could anticipate, and if such be the case with wisdom and experience to guide, what shall we expect from unsuspicious youth just entering a false world, serenely ignorant of its treacheries, an utter stranger to its guile? Will its goodness be its protection? The reverse. In such a trial it is the noblest who are the most exposed. The better the nature, the more imminent the danger it encounters. The cold, the heartless, the calculating have fair chance of escape, it is the warm, the trusting, the generous who are the usual sufferers. What so easily cheated as a fresh and faithful innocent heart, and by what right, according to what principle, I pray you, do we decide that there is one mistake that is never to be corrected, one error, the most fatal of all, which once committed, we shall never be permitted to repair?”

Sixth. It is objected that the bible is opposed to divorce. Agassiz says every great truth must go through three stages. 1st. It is opposed to the bible. 2d. It was discovered before. 3d. They always believed it.

Multitudes of passages can be quoted from the old testament showing that men took and put away wives at their pleasure. Polygamy and divorce were universally recognized as right among the Hebrews, and when Jesus was questioned on this subject he said he did not come to abrogate the laws of Moses, but to fulfill them. As he never descended in his teachings to the plane of policy, expediency or custom, he gave his questioners on this as on every subject, the highest moral view. With him the mere outward tie did not constitute marriage, but a soul-centred, constant love, that knew no change or abatement. No wandering of thought even, from the one cherished, chosen object of affection. How many who quote Jesus on this subject are ready to accept his doctrine of the true marriage?

That Jesus' disciples did not understand him as forbidding divorce is seen in the words of the apostles. Paul permitted it for desertion. Luther, Melancthon and Calvin, all advocated divorces. In the famed case of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, they granted divorce, and he married again by their permission, while the first wife still lived.

Such has been the position of the Protestant Church in all ages, and such is its position to-day. The bible argument on this question, properly treated, would be a lecture in itself; for those who wish to pursue this point I recommend John Milton's unanswerable argument. On this as on every other question, the bible is quoted on both sides.

While John Milton makes an unanswerable argument to prove that the highest, purest spiritual marriage of love, sympathy and companionship is taught there, and divorce right for all relations of antagonism and dissatisfaction, Moncure D. Conway takes the opposite view. He says:

"By adopting the Hebrew idea of indissoluble marriage, with a single exception, we force thousands to remain under the yoke of a relation that mutilates the affections and ruins the soul.

75

The ascetic law of marriage, ascribed to Jesus in Matthew, has been the means of killing more wives and husbands, the cause of more intrigues, and the training of more children amid daily examples of hypocrisy and meanness, than all other causes put together. The marriage superstition is one of the most cruel the world has ever seen. There is none without knowledge of the hecatombs slowly consumed on its properly called "altar," and it rests upon the bible. It was considered extravagant when Anacharsis Clutz said in the French Assembly, "The democratic principle is so sacred that it would be cheaply purchased by the destruction of the entire human race from the face of the earth," but his claim was not wilder than that of the monastic inheritance "the sacrament of marriage," which fills society with crimes, with wretched homes, starved affections, and alas! with malformations of heart and brain.

The relation that should be the most beautiful, one which must make every home, where it really exists, a temple and a school as well, is sacrificed to a book which demands that we shall on that point throw away the experience of thousands of years, and compress ourselves to a rite of barbarism.

All this talk about the indissoluble tie and the sacredness of marriage, irrespective of the character and habits of the husband, is for its effect on women. She never could have been held the pliant tool she is to-day but for the subjugation of her religious nature to the idea that in whatever condition she found herself as man's subject, that condition was ordained of Heaven; whether burning on the

funeral pile of her husband in India, or suffering the slower torture of bearing children every year in America to drunkards, diseased, licentious men, at the expense of her own life and health and the enfeebling of both the mind and body of her progeny. Women would not live as they now do in this enlightened age in violation of every law of their being, giving the very heyday of their existence to the exercise of one animal function, if subordination to man had not been made through the ages the cardinal point of their religious faith and daily life. It requires but little thought to see that the indissoluble tie was one of the necessary steps in this subjugation. Human nature will bear anything so long as ills seem inevitable but when a door of escape opens, the inborn love of life and freedom in the human soul fires the whole being to seek liberty at all risks, throwing old authorities and dogmas to the winds, and tramping the chains of a long and weary bondage beneath their proud, indignant feet. The indissoluble tie was found to be necessary in order to establish man's authority over woman. The argument runs thus:

Men all admit that if two cannot be agreed they must part. This 76 may apply to partners in business, pastor and people, physician and patient, master and servant, and many other relations in life; but in the case of parent and child, husband and wife, as their relations cannot be dissolved, there must be some alternate authority to decide all matters in which they cannot agree, hence man's headship. These cases should be distinguished, however; the child is free to act on his own opinions, by law, at a certain age, and the tie is practically dissolved between him and the parent so soon as he earns his own bread. The child is under the parent's control only during its minority; but the wife's condition is perpetual minority, life-long subjection to authority, with no appeal, no hope on the indissoluble tie theory. The practical effect of this is to make tyrants of men and fools of women. There never was a human being yet on this footstool godlike enough to be trusted with the absolute control of any living thing. Men abuse each other. Look in your prisons, jails, asylums, battle-fields and camps, they abuse their horses, dogs, cats, as Mr Bergh can testify. They abuse their own children, and of course they will abuse their wives, taught by law and gospel that they own them as property, especially as a wife can vex and thwart a man, as no other living thing can.

It is sheer folly at this age of the world to waste ink or words on marriage as an indissoluble tie and on the husbands's divinely ordained authority, for woman's growing self-respect and keen perception of the drift of these dogmas enable her at last to see that the long and weary bondage her sex has endured through the centuries was based in the beginning on these twin heresies.

If science, philosophy, religion and law combined shall finally settle this question on the basis of the indissoluble tie and male authority, my advice to my sex would be, beware of putting your heads into that noose. In fact I should consider a woman of virtue, independence and education, who would marry on such conditions, as lost to all true sense of Christian dignity and human freedom.

What should we have thought of Frederick Douglass, if, after having escaped from slavery and become an educated, worthy, respectable citizen in the Empire State, he had voluntarily gone back to Maryland to live under the slave code, where his person, his property, his powers of locomotion, his opinions were all subjected to a master? We should have said that he was either a fool or ignorant of the laws of a slave State. If marriage cannot be dissolved and man's authority, according to God's law, is absolute in that relation, women who enter it are either fools or ignorant of the laws that govern it. Verily, under such circumstances, it is better, as the apostle says, not to marry. In reading the learned writers on this question, I have been amused to see that, 77 while they differ so widely among themselves as to the different systems of marriage, they all agree on one point, man's absolute authority in all cases over woman. Religion and common sense alike teach that the true ends of marriage are solace, help, the spiritual growth of both parties, and intellectual and moral companionship.

The best interests of the individual, the family, the nation, cry out against these legalized marriages of discord and disgust.

We may divide those who marry, says a recent writer, into three classes:

First. The low order of unfortunates who obey no principle of contrast or attraction of either the flesh or the spirit. These are drawn together by mere proximity, a gravitation like inert masses, without one soulful or impassioned impulse, and held there by the tyranny of circumstances. Of this large class I shall say nothing, because they are, as it were, in moral lazaret houses, and there is too much to be done for them in all directions to philosophize on any special reform in their condition. These are the hotbeds of disease, vice, crime, violence and war. They have violated every law, human and divine, blindly no doubt; nevertheless they must pay the penalty in that physical and moral death that knows no resurrection.

The second class to come up one step higher are drawn together by the attraction of physical difference. The world moves by the combination of opposing forces. In the magnetism of love one party is positive, the other negative, and they mutually attract, the grave to the gay, the sunny to the severe, the fair to the dark, the tall to the short, the plump to the lean, &c. Such unions have no element of the permanent, but they are for time alone, unless the inner natures are complemented also.

In the third and highest class we find the few, who, obeying the subtle attraction of spiritual as well as physical difference, love each other for time and eternity. There is love terrestrial and love celestial. There is one beauty of the earth, another of the stars, a beauty of rounded lines and fresh

colors, and a subjective beauty which fadeth not away. Blessed are they who love for that alone, who, in a true spiritual union, find an element of the permanent, that like myrrh and frankincense, sweetens and glorifies life, makes gods of men and women and paradise on earth. One of these unions has given the world a John Stuart Mill, who in his writings unites the consciousness and strength of the man with the tenderness and inspiration of the woman; and whether speaking of trade, science, philosophy or law, a deep abiding love for humanity breathes in every line. He and his glorified wife were one in all their studies, interests and ambitions. Whatever came from the pen of one was the united thought of both. She first roused him to the question of woman's enfranchisement, and as he says opened to him a whole new world of thought. And now that she has passed into the better-land, he watches beside her new-made grave, in daily communion still, for in his last great work every page glows with woman's thought and feeling. When the thin veil that parts them to-day is withdrawn he will find her, no doubt, still lingering on the threshold of time that together they may begin the work of eternity. And this is marriage, a true union of soul and intellect, which leads, exalts and sanctifies the physical consummation.

Sometimes we catch a strain of music that makes all discord harmony, that fills the soul with tenderness and love, and yet with such courage and heroism that one could do and dare and suffer all things. This is the soul of sex in music joined, and when fairy fingers can interpret to the world the melancholy compositions of Beethovens and Mendelssohns the sad strains will be turned to joy, to triumph and gladness. Man waits to-day for woman's soul to meet him on the heights of science, philosophy, poetry and art, where he has so long dwelt alone, just as the sacred fabulist tells us he did for her coming at creation's dawn. His isolation in the soul and intellect is the sad wail in nature that cannot be satisfied with simply a union of the flesh. The great and good in all ages have felt these yearnings for the higher, truer marriage. Men have philosophized and poetized about it, legislated on it, but never touched the kernel of the question, because it is a relation that concerns man and woman equally, and its corner-stone must be laid in the freedom and equality of both parties. May noble men and women who have suffered in their marriage relations have called aloud for its dissolution.

Alex. Humboldt, who died not long since, said: "Marriage, having this peculiarity, this its objects are frustrated when the feelings of both parties are not in harmony with it, should require nothing but the declared will of either party to dissolve it."

John Milton said: "Those who marry intend as little to conspire their own ruin as those who swear allegiance, and as a whole people is to an ill government, so is one man or woman to an ill marriage."

Jeremy Bentham said: "A condition requiring a continuance of marriage, notwithstanding a change of feeling in the parties, is absurd, shocking and contrary to humanity."

Ritcher said: "He considered that every marriage in which the purest love failed on either side, was no better than a work of adultery."

Charlotte Bronte said: "When a wife's nature loathes that of the man she is wedded to, marriage must be slavery; against slavery all 79 right thinkers revolt, and though torture be the price of resistance, torture must be dared; though the only road to freedom be through the gates of death, these gates must be passed, for freedom is indispensable."

John Stuart Mill says: "The subject of marriage is usually discussed as if the interests of children were everything, those of grown persons nothing."

Charles Dickens says: "I read in the papers at every sessions of the assizes, how the impossibility of ever getting unchained from one brings blood upon the land."

But suppose the tie dissolved, what then? Nothing but to form others equally unsatisfactory; for so long as woman remains man's subject, ever in the valley of humiliation, while he enjoys the purer atmosphere on the mountain tops, and in hours of ease comes down to her, they meet only in their grosser natures—he is bereft of half his power, and she sad and dissatisfied—because she knows she is cheated of her birthright, to rise to the same sublime heights where in his highest moments he walks with the gods knowing good and evil. It is sad to look over the record of all those who have been wrecked in this delusive dream of happiness, and to know that hundreds are groaning in just such bondage to-day, and that the young, the gay, the brave, the beautiful, are all launching their barks for the same island of enchantment. From the days of Socrates to Charles Dickens, there has been one long succession of unfortunate examples—Poet and Painter, Dramatist and Novelist, Philosopher and Linguist. The Molières, the Miltons, the Byrons, the Bulwers, the Deuriers, the Sheridans, the Thackerays, will all marry and quarrel in the future as they have in the past, and all men, without exception, will, in the future as the past, blame their wives for their several successive catastrophies. And yet what a record of heartlessness and indifference some of our greatest men have left of their domestic life.

Dr. Franklin, that old utilitarian kite-flyer, went to Europe, leaving his wife behind, and never saw her face for eleven years. She had shared his poverty, practiced his poor Richard maxims, pinched and economized, patched and darned, worked early and late, bred children and nursed them through sprue, jaundice, red gum, whooping cough, measles, scarlet fever and fits, while Benjamin enjoyed the splendors of a court, velvet couches, good dinners and choice society. Of course, when he came

back the poor drudge was no match for the philosopher; there was a great gulf between them. Like too many women, she expended all her powers on the animal wants of her household, without holding one hour in the twenty-four sacred to herself for her own cultivation and improvement. That her heart rebelled in her solitude and so neglect is manifest in the headstrong acts of their children. He quarreled with his sons and disinherited one of them; thus were the mother's wrongs revenged. A just retribution for every injustice to woman is sure to come in the vice and crime of her children, to the third and fourth generation. The less said of Benjamin Franklin's private character the better. William Franklin, Governor of New Jersey, was his natural son, and how many more of the same sort he had probably Franklin himself never knew. This son was a Tory, and disagreed violently with his father in politics. Undazzled by the glories of Franklin stoves and lightning rods, one sees much to disapprove in the life of the great philosopher.

Henry Clay, too, thought he could safely leave his wife at Ashland, to bear children and make butter for the Lexington market, while he made laws for the nation and love to lovely women in Washington. There his heart stood always open as any boarding-house door, but shut against her who was playing Solomon's wise woman on a farm in Kentucky, cutting out linsey and jeane for the negroes. His dream of ambition over, sick and sad he went back to Ashland to find that the domestic drudge, called by the holy name of wife, had reared up for him a race of degenerate children. He was filled with disappointment; but his sorrow measured the depths of the mother's humiliation. The angels of incidence and retaliation were but equal. Was it the unhappy mother that made one son crazy with hopeless love; another a sour, discontented man, overcome through life with a sense of inferiority; and jockeys and gamblers of the rest?

Truly wisdom is justified of her children; we do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs from thistles. We cannot quench our thirst at sweet and pleasant streams whose fountains we have poisoned. Great pacificator! shallow protectionist! how could he with his narrow political creed ever fathom the causes of our social wrongs? He might despise the wife who ministered to him in carnal things, but just and mighty was her revenge.

Henry Clay is dead, his compromise measures are scattered to the winds, but his misdeeds live long after him. His son Theodore lingered in the insane asylum at Lexington fifty years, and died but a few months, since—a long, weary life of hopeless despondency.

Oliver Ellsworth, chief justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and successor to Ben. Franklin, at the court of France, married the grand-daughter of the Gov. of Connecticut, Roger Wolcott. She was well educated, saw the best company of the time, was a woman of strong natural sense, and inherited great talent. After marriage she gave up books, society, travel, and devoted herself to raising a large family and so managing a large farm, and to both departments she brought

such high qualities that her labors were entirely successful. All her children possessed health, sense and sound moral principle, while she so prudently managed their financial affairs that wealth also was their portion. One son was an influential member of Congress, Governor of Connecticut, and Judge of the Supreme Court; another was one of the largest land owners in the West, and Commissioner of Patents in Washington. One daughter married the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Connecticut, &c., all taking the first rank in society. Late in life, in reviewing her course and its results, she used to say she had made one grave error. She thought it her constant duty to stay with her family on the farm and best help her husband in that way. He went to Washington always without her, to France without her, and though their affection was not lost, their knowledge of each other became unsatisfactory. She used to say to her daughters, keep with your husbands; go for a few weeks or months every winter to Washington; never mind the long, tedious, muddy stage ride; keep with them at any sacrifice; read, think, keep pace with them in knowledge and attainment. My husband grew away from me, not in affection wholly but attainment. We started together; I had seen as much of life, books, good society, as he had; we were equals, capable of spiritual and intellectual companionship, but I gave up everything, lived with children and servants, took no note of the world without, no interest in national questions, in the subjects that absorbed his mind. With good society, foreign travel, reading, thought, his views grew broader daily, too broad to meet me in the narrow world where all my thoughts were dwarfed and centered in family selfishness. I knew nothing of the people, books and subjects that engrossed his later life. We bore the same name, my solitude was respectable, but my heart yearned for something more.

"The household," says Emerson, "is the home of man as well as the child. The events that occur therein are more near and affecting to us than those which are sought in senates and academies. Domestic events are certainly our affairs. What are called public events may or may not be ours. If a man wishes to acquaint himself with the real history of the world, with the spirit of the age, he must not go first to the state-house or the court-room. The subtle spirit of life must be sought in facts nearer. It is what is done and suffered in the home, in the constitution, in the temperament, in the personal history, that has the profoundest interest for us."

Instead of leaving everything in the home to chance, as now, we should apply science and philosophy to our daily life. I should feel that I had not lived in vain, if faith of mine could roll off the soul of woman that dark cloud, that nightmare, that false belief that all her weaknesses and disabilities are natural, that her sufferings in maternity are a punishment for the sins of Adam and Eve, and teach her the higher gospel, that by obedience to natural law she might secure uninterrupted health and happiness for herself, and mould future generations to her will. When we consider all a mother's influences over her child—anti-natal as well as educational—we see her power is only second to that of God himself. There is no such sacredness and responsibility

in any human relation as in that of the mother. Every passion, sentiment, impulse of her being is daguerreotyped in her child. As thought moulds matter, the ideas that occupy her mind shape the cranium of the future man. Just as the sculptor carves his statue, and under his skillful touch, day by day, the rough block of marble is transformed into an angel of light, so will educated and enlightened mothers, in the new civilization now dawning upon us, make the sons and daughters of coming years like gods, knowing good and evil. To this end we must learn how to live and how to marry, how to educate ourselves and children for the reproduction not only of the mortal but immortal part of our natures. There is a good deal said, rather deplorably, to-day, about the small families of the Americans. When people begin to weigh the momentous consequences of bringing badly organized children into the world there will be fewer still.

To simply propagate our kind is a more animal function that we share in common with the beasts of the field, but when in self-denial, a pure, chaste, beautiful life, obedient to every law of soul and body, a mother can give the world, one noble, healthy, happy man or woman, a perpetual blessing in the home, the Church and the State, she will do a better work for humanity than in adding numbers alone, with but little regard for quality. What should we think of an artist who should occupy the heyday of his life, straining every nerve to fill miles of galleries with humpbacked, crooked-legged statuary, huge, gloomy landscapes, with prim foliage, lakes and clouds like geometrical figures, and men and women like trees walking? We should say he might better have passed his time in Italy, studying the old masters, cultivating his taste and then have produced one beautiful painting or marble statue that would have made him immortal. If thought and preparation for such results is so desirable, how much more in the creation of beings that suffer the penalties of all our violations of law; and yet here, where the consequences of ignorance and thoughtlessness are so terrible and far-reaching, wise men and women leave everything to chance, and in the midst of vice, poverty, sorrow and disappointment, make Providence the scape-goat for their follies and misfortunes. It is far easier to create a new order of men and women, than to reform what surrounds us now. Home-life to-day, to the best of us, has its shadows and sorrows, and because of our ignorance this must needs be. Husbands and wives full of imperfections, children weak, vicious and deformed, gather round our hearthstones, reflecting our discords and telling the world the heartburnings and disappointments we would fain conceal. The good, the true, the bright, the beautiful, the promising, are offset in nearly all our households, with the deformed, the imbecile, the depraved; and, alas! how one failure here shadows all our lives.

Together we suffer, together let us work for the new civilization now dawning upon us.

The day is breaking! It is something to know that life's ills are not showered upon us by the Great Father from a kind of Pandora's box, but are the results of causes that we have the power to control.

By a knowledge and observance of law, the road to health and happiness opens before us: a joy and peace that passeth all understanding shall yet be ours and Paradise regained on earth. When marriage results from a true union of intellect and spirit—when mothers and fathers give to their holy offices even the preparation of soul and body that the artist gives to the conception of his poem, statue or landscape, then will marriage, maternity and paternity acquire a new sacredness and dignity, and a nobler type of manhood and womanhood will glorify the race.

After Mrs. Stanton's address, Rev. Olympia brown made a few impressive remarks, and the Convention adjourned *sine die*.

APPENDIX: CONTAINING A HISTORY OF THE WORK OF THE WINTER OF 1871, WITH MEMORIAL OF MRS. V. C. WOODHULL, AND REPORT OF MINORITY AND MAJORITY OF HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.

86

At the close of the Decade meeting it was decided to hold a National Convention in Washington, January, 1871. For this convention preparations were duly made by the committee.

As the friends came together they found that the work had assumed a new phase.

The intricacy of the question seemed likely to be unraveled sooner than anticipated. When the English statesmen were all at fault and could see no way out of their embarrassments, in relation to chattel slavery, a Woman, with a large brain and a large heart, wrote out the simple sentence, "Immediate and unconditional emancipation," and the West India question was peaceably settled in seven years. Brougham, Wilberforce and Romilly and Clarkson sat at the feet of Elizabeth Heyrick and learned wisdom of her. They recognized the divine inspiration, and now when another woman comes with a like inspiration and offers to show the way out of a still more intricate and embarrassing question—not the giving of freedom to a small race but to one half the inhabitants of our country—a few of our statesman recognize her inspiration, and gladly seize upon it to solve the problem.

The letter of Mrs. Griffing, secretary of the committee, the organizing working power at Washington, gives the history very clearly of Mrs. Woodhull's work, and of the progress since December, 1870, up to April 10, 1871. To Mrs. Woodhull's active energy and judicious conduct of her work in Washington, we, as the disfranchised class, owe a deep debt of gratitude:

My Dear Mrs. Davis:

Having been present at the decade meeting, held in the City of New York in October last, 1870, and listened to your very interesting and accurate statement of the woman's rights movement, since its first public inception in 1848, permit me to thank you and to express my earnest hope that you will not fail to print it.

Such a review is already called for by those whose attention is now, for the first time, turned to the question, and to the future generations it is absolutely necessary, including as it does, the grandest lesson in the triumph of human freedom.

In this history you have not only pointed out each inductive step of progress, but have made faithful mention of the early workers, who, by indomitable energy, self-sacrifice and devotion to truth and principle, have laid a foundation, in the moral sense of the age, for a complete recognition of woman's personality, hitherto denied, and upon which a Universal Republic shall be established that shall live, when kingdoms and thrones shall be forgotten in the civilizations of the world.

87

Only one thing I would add to your manuscript, which is the part taken and the name of the author of this historic statement as one of the brightest stars in the pathway that marks this glorious era of woman's struggle.

Hitherto the work has been mainly inductive, a presentation of human rights and woman's wrongs.

For the first time it is now recognized as a political issue, and simple justice before the law, not expediency or position, is the point alone to be settled.

"The mill of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small."

It now appears that under the Federal Constitution and its amendments, woman is entitled to equal rights of citizenship with man; and as voting is a fundamental right of the citizen in a free government, woman not only may, but should vote.

The last Woman Suffrage Convention, held in Washington, D. C., Jan., 1871, called by Paulina W. Davis, J. S. Griffing and I. B. Hooker, in behalf of the women of the country, contemplated no new issue, proposed only to discuss the moral question, the Sixteenth Amendment and a more thorough system of education for the women of the country, through the issue of a monthly series of tracts.

With slight exception, this programme would have been the order of the convention, as it was the indication of the call, had not the time arrived for the budget note, calling all "to the front." Events

of the hour at once changed the direction of thought, and inaugurated a line of movement for the practical enfranchisement of, and restoration to, woman, of her equal rights as an American citizen.

A few days previous to the time of holding this convention, Mrs. Victoria C. Woodhull, of the City of New York, memorialized Congress for the exercise of the elective franchise, which memorial was read in the House of Representatives, by Hon. George W. Julian, early friend of the cause, referred to the Judiciary Committee and ordered to be printed.

This action on the part of Mrs. Woodhull, was taken without consultation with the moves for, or even knowledge of, the convention, and by unprecedented energy and great intelligence, pressed upon the attention of both branches of Congress, upon the plea that she was "born upon the soil and was subject to the jurisdiction of the United States," and that as a citizen, she desired a voice in legislation, through the only means in a free government, that of a vote; and on this *pivot* she based her demand. With some difficulty she obtained permission for a hearing before the judiciary Committee, but at the time of the opening of the convention, the day was not fixed.

88

Learning this important step taken by Mrs. Woodhull, a stranger to the convention, a conference was held between the parties, resulting in a friendly agreement, that with consent of the chairman of the committee, Mrs. I. B. Hooker, on the part of the convention, should at the same time, through a constitutional lawyer, Hon. A. G. Riddle, ex-member of Congress, defend the memorialists (30,000 women) whose names were already before the Congress, asking also, to exercise the right of the ballot.

Mrs. Woodhull, who personally embodied womanhood in her defence, spoke with power and marvelous effect, as though conscious of a right unjustly withheld, a feeling a duty, she was forbidden to do. Under the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, and the 14th and 15th Amendments thereto, she asked equal protection to person, property, and full citizenship, in response to this, the key-note, Mr Riddle followed with an unanswerable legal argument, sweeping away all laws of the United States, and of any State, restricting woman in the right to vote, as directly opposed to the supreme law of the land, as pointed out in the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Federal Constitution, which he showed to be consonant with both the letter and spirit of that instrument. He also suggested that the immediate action of woman, as a citizen, might be found the most speedy method of triumph.

The result of this hearing, in the printed reports of Judge Bingham and the majority, and of Judge Loughridge and Hon. B. F. Butler, the minority of the Judiciary Committee, is *already* before the country, and marks well the beginning of the end.

It was now clearly seen by the leaders of the movement that the agitation of woman's wrongs and oppressions was no longer a necessary part of the discussion. That in the statute books, and above all, in the heart of God, a record of this was made, and that henceforth woman's citizenship and full enfranchisement must be declared. That under the supreme law of the land her right to person, property, children, and full and equal citizenship must be *pronounced* and admitted; and, finally, her *duty* to vote, and through her highest capabilities, to assume a share of the responsibility of the State, as she has already off the home, are hereafter to be the legitimate theme of discussion till woman is emancipated.

These events and this decision indicated an immediate want of a National Woman's Suffrage and Educational Committee, to carry forward measures for the speedy execution of the work, and upon consultation with the experienced and wise men and women of the convention, and with the approval of all well-wishers who were present, a committee, consisting of Mrs. I. B. Hooker (Chairwoman), J. S. Griffing (Sec'y), 89 Mrs. M. B. (Treas.), Susan B. Anthony, Paulina W. Davis and Ruth Carr Denison, was organized at the City of Washington, D. C., and machinery set in operation to accomplish what is now known as the work of the committee.

For the temporary use of this committee a part of the House Education and Labor Committee-room, through the marked kindness of Hon. Mr. Arnell, chairman of the committee, was granted. Afterward the beautiful artistic House Agriculture Committee-room, also used for Manufacture Committee, was generously proffered by the chairmen of both, Hon. Mr. Morrell and Gen'l Smith, and is still retained.

Books are now opened for signatures to the new Declaration and Pledge, and the autograph of all women now ready to exercise the elective franchise, and thousands of tracts, constitutional arguments of Mr. Riddle and Mrs. Woodhull, reports of the minority Judiciary Committee, and an address to the women of the United States, are being sent to the whole country, carrying conviction to the weak, force to the active, and hastening the consummation of a triumph worthy of the struggle and undying faith of all who have nobly borne their part in this history.

The names of the earnest women who took part in this convention, and who participated in the inauguration of the new issue, are recorded in the books of the committee; and now, only the funds—generous and prompt contributions—are needed to respond to the call from all the States and Territories for knowledge—either by voice or pen—to complete a reconstruction of the government “of the people, for the people and by the people,” without arms, court-martial or bloodshed. Give, *give* is the call of the committee, and *give* is the prayer of all the true workers in the advance woman's rights movement, and whatsoever you mete shall be measured to you again.

Most truly, J. S. Griffing.

In this connection Mrs. B. Lockwood's very liable memorial to Congress asking suffrage for what women of the District should be mentioned. It was a well-sustained arguments, showing the writer to be mistress of her subject.

Mrs. Lockwood is an efficient, earnest honest worker. She presented to Congress a large petition, fully equal in numbers to the one presented by Mrs. Dahlgren and Sherman, whose anti-suffrage petition and their memorial against it formed one of the peculiar features of the work of last winter.

Mrs. H. C. Spencer, of Washington, answered Mrs. Dablgren's 90 pamphlet with a most admirable one entitled Problems, which has already had an extensive circulation, and is more earnestly called for than any other, with the exception of Mrs. Woodhull's constitutional arguments, and Mr. Riddle's on the same question.

The meetings were held daily in the committee-room during the entire session, and the interchange of thought was often very interesting and encouraging.

On the day of the adjournment of Congress Mrs. Hooker presented thanks, in the name of the committee, to such members of the House as had been most active in serving our cause. The following are the reports of the speeches made on that occasion:

Gentlemen: The National Woman Suffrage and Educational Committee desire me to express to you their heartfelt thanks for the good service you have rendered the whole woman movement by your willingness to entertain, examine, and in some instances advocate our new claim that we are already enfranchised under the original Constitution and the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

To you, Mr. Julian, we are especially indebted, in that while you were the first member of the House who introduced our claim to the suffrage under the form of a Sixteenth Amendment, you were in the front once more when a new issue was presented in the shape of the "Woodhull Memorial." Your resolution asking the House "to participate in the proceedings," by which two women citizens of the United States "might present the moral and constitutional argument in favor of the enfranchisement of the women citizens of the United States, and in support of a memorial lately reported upon by a majority and minority of the Judiciary Committee," was in keeping with every other act of your public life, a protest against injustice, a proposition looking toward perfect equality; and we thank you for it in the name of the disfranchised million who will one day realize, as they now do not, the significance of that act.

To you, Mr. Arnell, we owe not only the passage of "A bill to do justice to the female employés of the government," but the first admission of women to this Capitol as citizens having common rights with the ruling class in the use of buildings devoted to the public service. In your committee-room we found not only a home, but such courtesy, such opportunity for friendly consultation with members of Congress upon subjects of deepest political importance as must forever silence the absurd charge that men and women will cease to regard the decorums of life, to interchange its happy civilities when they become equally responsible for the welfare of the State.

To other gentlemen of the House we owe thanks also for their co-operations with you in this manly service especially to General Wilson, of Ohio; to Mr. Morrell, of Pennsylvania; and General Butler, of Massachusetts, who have, as chairman of their respective committee, offered us the use of their several rooms, in case the threats of a certain gentleman in the House should to terrify you, sir, that you should feel compelled to withdraw your most friendly offer. We have accepted the use of the Committee-room on Agriculture, leaving you, sir, with reluctance, simply because it is larger and more accessible than your room, and one so beautifully adorned by art, that our womanly tastes are daily gratified in its use.

To you, Mr. Loughridge, as the author of the minority report of the Judiciary Committee on the Woodhull Memorial, and to General Butler, your faithful colleague, we owe that most luminous statement of the historic position of woman, her natural, civil and constitutional rights, and the best method of enforcing these in the interest of the woman citizens of the United States. For that report, sir, we thank you from the depth of our 91 hearts. We claim it as our bill of rights. On that line we also will fight, not with weapons of steel, but with pen and voice and silent prayer, wrestling even till the break of day; and when at last the solemn responsibilities of citizenship shall have been laid upon us by the men of this great nation, and together we shall strive to bring justice and equality into legislation and administration, we shall not forget to whom we owe this first judicial protest in these halls against traditional misrepresentations of the Constitutional rights of women citizens of the Republic.

And, gentlemen, permit us to congratulate you all, that having secured equal rights to all men in these United States by your vote, and having welcomed the prescribed black man to a seat by your side in halls of legislation, you are now turning your attention to the women of the United States, with a firm resolution that they shall no longer be denied the rights nor excused from the responsibilities of a full citizenship.

Permit us to express the hope that in coming years you may be returned to this Capitol by the votes of grateful women citizens, enfranchised through your instrumentality; and should you be called to

take upper seats here in remembrance of faithful service during this session we shall congratulate not only ourselves but our common and well-beloved country; and if, gentlemen, you should find here as colleagues some of the matrons of this Republic whose names are now being daily signed to this new declaration of fealty to human rights, we have confident assurance that you will cheerfully work hand in hand with them according to the tenor of their pledge to work with you "for the maintenance of those equal rights on which our Republic was originally founded, to the end that it may have what is declared to be the first condition of just government— *the consent of the governed*.

When Mrs. Hooker resumed her seat Mr. Julian arose and said:

REMARKS OF MR. JULIAN.

I thank you, Mrs. Hooker, and the committee you represent, for your words of cordial approbation. Such a testimony will go far to redeem the ordinary drudgery and dreariness of public life, and I shall ever cherish it with satisfaction and pride. I ought say, however, that in performing the acts so handsomely commended by you I did nothing but my simple duty. Indeed, constituted as I am, and believing as I do, it was morally impossible for me to do otherwise. Having espoused the cause of woman's enfranchisement more than twenty years ago, when it was first launched in the United States, and having labored so long and so earnestly for the enfranchisement of the male citizens of our country, irrespective of color or race, it would have been grossly inconsistent in me, not to say recreant and mean, to shrink from the duties for which you compliment me when invited to their performance.

You are pleased to express the hope that some of the retiring members of the Forty-first Congress may hereafter be returned to the places they have filled. For myself, I am weary of the service in which I have toiled for so many years, and I welcome a season of rest, or at least a change of labor. But when your hope goes farther, and points to our return here by the votes of enfranchised women, and our welcome from a sisterhood of co-representatives in the halls of Congress, I confess the prophecy is so pleasing and the picture seems so tempting that its realization would completely reconcile me to my restored place in the House of Representatives, or even to a seat in that smaller body at the other end of the Capitol.

And I am not lacking in the spirit of good courage and hope which animates you. These are revolutionary times. Whole years of progress are now crowded into days. Who will venture to judge the future by any political almanac of by-gone times? I can say with old Thomas Carlyle, "One strong thing I find here below, the just thing, the true thing. And no man or party is strong enough, no

earthly power is strong enough to stay the grand march of events through which the hand of God is visibly guiding the Republic to universal liberty, and through that to enduring prosperity and peace.

92

MR. ARNELL, OF TENNESSEE,

followed with a few pertinent remarks:

Mrs. Hooker and Ladies: You have been kind enough to refer to me by name. I think you have been over-generous in your estimation of my poor services. If I have accomplished anything, no matter how inconsiderable, for your cause, I greatly rejoice. Yet, in reality, it is my cause as much as yours—a man's cause as much as a woman's; for the inquiry you have raised is a great fundamental question, broad as humanity itself.

I thank you for your wide interpretation of the invitation I gave you to occupy the Committee-room of Education and Labor. You have rightly touched its true meaning. The doors were opened hopefully, invitingly to you as the advance-guard of American women who are soon, I trust, to take equal part with their brothers, husbands and fathers in the government of this great and free Republic. There is a bit of history connected with this room of Education and Labor. A hard-working woman was once driven from it by vote of the House of Representatives. She carried her work across the ocean, rested it under the Italian skies, until it blossomed into everlasting stone. Then she brought it back. A great admiring city and the self-same men who had voted her out marveled and said "Well done, woman." Her success is a triumph for woman. Meantime you, representing, arguing a higher cause than Art, had found a footing in this very apartment from which she had been turned out. This was a higher triumph. The amiable New York Tribune, chuckling over a false rumor that you were denied its further use, has misstated the facts. The tribune only advertised its own narrow, pretentious wishes. In bringing the proposition before Congress to pay women the same price as men, for the same work performed, I desired not only to help those spirited, deserving women in the Departments, but also to aid two and a half millions of my working sisters in this country.

It seemed to me that just here was room for practical legislation. Here was an angle to be carried in this great contest for justice and freedom, and I drew my best inspiration from a bright, sunny-faced wife, who to-day is far away among the hills of Tennessee. I greatly admire and respect either a working man or woman, for I devoutly believe in this latest evangel that "to work is to pray."

Allow me to say, as a parting word, "Courage." The world may sneer at you, for it does not behave that a man is moved save by some selfish ambition. Trojan's noble fraction of a line, "*indocillis privata loqui*," is not generally considered as adapted to, or to be applied to, the domain of every-day life.

Yet, ladies, far above all ridicule, misjudgment, slander, and abuse even, is the holy consciousness you have of the nobility of your work, which is, as I have said, the emancipation and elevation of both man and woman.

Let me remind you of a saying of Saint Bernard. He says, that "at the last day it will not be asked of us what we have done, or said, or believed, but what have we loved." On this will rest the judgment of our lives.

The great Republic, of which you are citizens, by express provision of its fundamental law, can exist only as it is free, as it is just: two ideas that lie, as I understand it, at the bottom of your movement. The country must continue one-sided, ill-balanced, imperfect in its civilization, until woman, with her peculiar nature, is admitted to that individuality which of right belongs to every human being. Therefore I bid you Godspeed in your work.

JUDGE LOUGHRIDGE, OF IOWA,

spoke as follows:

Ladies I take pleasure in appearing here in response to your kind invitation. I understand fully your desire to express in this way your appreciation of the aid given by a portion of the Representatives to the Forty-first Congress to the cause you have so much at heart, the cause of universal suffrage and political liberty.

93

In reference to the report of the minority of the Judiciary Committee, to which Mrs. Hooker has referred in such complimentary terms and in which I had the honor to join with the distinguished gentlemen from Massachusetts, Mr. Butler, I am glad to know that you are satisfied with it, and that you think it does justice to your cause.

What is written there is the honest conviction on my judgment, and in my opinion the principles contended for therein will, before many years, be accepted as the law of the land. I desire to say one word, suggested by the remark which I have heard made frequently of late, that the only resort now for the advocates of women suffrage is to the courts of the country.

I think it is a mistake. In this country, on questions involving political rights, the courts are generally in the rear rank; the people are mostly in advance of the courts.

In my opinion the most speedy and certain victory will be acquired through the political departments of the Government, which are moulded and controlled by the people, and which will always in the end reflect the will of the people.

You applied to Congress; although not successful, yet the support you did receive was greater than the most sanguine expected. Continue your efforts, persevere in your determination, and in the end you will win, for you are right, and the right always triumphs.

The ladies then shook hands with each of these gentlemen and added a few words of personal thanks, after which the committee adjourned.

DECLARATION AND PLEDGE.

We publish the Declaration and Pledge which was issued in Washington in January last. In relation to it we have had many letters, saying "I want to sign the declaration, but I do not like the pledge." In reply to this I answer that to a deeply thinking, conscientious mind pledges are unneedful, they belong to the past. For those who sign it without consideration it may serve as a goad to duty.

"We, the undersigned, believing that the sacred rights and privileges of citizenship in this Republic have been long guaranteed to us by the original Constitution of the United States, and that these are now made manifest in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, so that we can no longer refuse the solemn responsibilities thereof, do hereby pledge ourselves to accept the duties of the franchise in our several States so soon as all legal restrictions are removed.

"And, believing that character is the best safeguard of national liberty, we pledge ourselves to make the personal purity and integrity of candidates for public office the first test for fitness.

"And, lastly, believing in God as the Supreme Author of the first American Declaration of Independence, we pledge ourselves in the spirit of that memorable act to work hand in hand with our fathers, husbands and sons for the maintenance of those equal rights of which our Republic was originally founded, to the end that it may have what it declared to be the first condition of just government—the consent of the governed."

The books are now in Washington, and hundreds are sending in their names—to Mrs. Griffing. One dollar with the name will secure two copies of the history, for circulation in your neighborhood. All

that is now needed is earnest, united effort to show that Women are determined and will stand together at all hazards.

PHEBE COUZINS.

On the eve of closing this work, which is to be considered a book of reference, the new comes that on the 8th of May 1871, the Law Faculty of the Washington University of St. Louis, conferred on Miss Phebe Couzins the Degree of Bachelor of Laws, and that an elegant entertainment was given by Dr. and Mrs. G. S. Walker to Miss Couzins, and to the Board of Directors and the Law Faculty.

A few invitations to this *recherche* entertainment found their way East to some of the older workers in the woman's movement.

95

THE MEMORIAL OF VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, respectfully sheweth:

That she was born in the State of Ohio, and is above the age of twenty-one years; that she has resided in the State of New York during the past three years; that she is still a resident thereof, and that she is a citizen of the United States, as declared by the XIV. Article of Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

That since the adoption of the XV. Article of Amendments to the Constitution, neither the State of New York nor nay other State, nor any Territory, has passed any law to abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote, as established by said article, neither on account of sex or otherwise:

That, nevertheless, the right to vote is denied to women citizens of the United States, by the operation of Election Laws in the several States and Territories, which laws were enacted prior to the adoption of the said XV. Article, and which are inconsistent with the Constitution as amended, and therefore, are void and of no effect; but which, being still enforced by the said States and Territories, reader the Constitution inoperative as regards the right of women citizens to vote:

And whereas, Article VI., Section 2, declares "That this Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and all judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution and laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding:"

And whereas, no distinction between citizens is made in the Constitution of the United States on account of sex; but the XV. article of Amendments to it provides that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

And whereas, Congress has power to make laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, and to make or alter all regulations in relation to holding elections for senators or representatives, and especially to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of the said XIV. Article:

And whereas, the continuance of the enforcement of said local election laws, denying and abridging the right of citizens to vote on account of sex, is a grievance to your memorialist and to various other persons, citizens of the United States, being women—

Therefore, your memorialist would most respectfully petition your Honorable Bodies to make such laws as in the wisdom of Congress shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the right vested by the Constitution in the Citizens of the United States to vote, without regard to sex.

And your memorialist will ever pray. VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

Dated New York City, December 19, 1870.

96

List Congress,} {Report 3d Session} HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES {No. 22 VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

January 30, 1871.— Recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Bingham, from the Committee on the Judiciary, made the following REPORT.

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom use referred the Memorial of Victoria C. Woodhull, having considered the same, make the following report:

The Memorialist asks the enactment of a law by Congress which shall secure to citizens of the United States in the several States the right to vote "without regard to sex." Since the adoption of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution, there is no longer any reason to doubt that all persons, born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside, for that is the express declaration of the amendment.

The clause of the fourteenth amendment, "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States," does not in the opinion of the committees, refer to privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States other than those privileges and immunities embraced in the original text of the Constitutions, Article IV., Section 2. The fourteenth amendment, it is believed, did not add to the privileges or immunities before mentioned, but was deemed necessary for their enforcement, as an express limitation upon the powers of the States. It has been judicially determined that the first eight articles of amendment of the constitution were not limitations on the power of the States, and it was apprehended that the same might be held of the provision of the second section, fourth article.

To remedy this defect of the Constitution, the express limitations upon the States contained in the first section of the fourteenth amendment, together with the grant of power in congress to enforce them by legislation, were incorporated in the Constitution. The words "citizens of the United States," and "citizens of the States," as employed in the fourteenth amendment, did not change or modify the relations of citizens of the State and Nation as they existed under the original Constitutions.

Attorney General Bates gave the opinion that the Constitution uses the word "citizen," only to express the political quality of the individual in his relation to the Nation; to declare that he is a member of the body politic, and bound to it by the reciprocal obligation of allegiance on the one side and protection on the other. The phrase "a citizen of the United States," without addition on qualification, means neither more nor less than a member of the Nation. (Opinion of Attorney General Bates on citizenship.)

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that, according to the express words and clear meaning of the second section, fourth article of the Constitution, no privileges are secured by it except those which belong to citizenship. (Connor *et al.* vs. Elliott *et al.*, 18 Howard, 593.,

In *Corfield vs. Coryell*, 4 Washington Circuit Court Reports , 380, the court say:

The inquiry is, what are the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States? We felt no hesitation in confining these expressions to those privileges and immunities which are in 97 their nature fundamental; which belong of right to the citizens of all free governments; and which have at all times been enjoyed by the citizens of the several States which compose this Union, from the time of their becoming free, independent and sovereign. What these fundamental principles are would, perhaps, be more tedious than difficult to enumerate. They may, however, be all comprehend under the following general heads: Protection by the Government; the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the right to acquire and possess property of every kind, and to pursue and obtain happiness and safety, subject, nevertheless, to such restraints as the Government may justly prescribe for the general good of the whole; the right of a citizen of one State to pass through or to reside in any other State, for the purpose of trade, agriculture, professional pursuits, or otherwise; to claim the benefit of the writ of *habeas corpus*; to institute and maintain actions of any kind in the courts of the State; to take, hold, and dispose of property, either or personal; and an exemption from higher taxes or impositions than are paid by the other citizen of the State, may be mentioned as some of the particular privileges and immunities of citizens which are clearly embraced by the general descriptions of privileges deemed to be fundamental; to which may be added the elective franchise, as regulated and established by the laws or Constitution of State in which it is to be exercised. * * * But we cannot accede to the propositions which was insisted on by the counsel, that under this provision of the Constitution, sec. 2., art. 4, the citizens of the several States are permitted to participate in all the rights which belong exclusively to the citizens of any other particular State.

The learned Justice Story declared that the intention of the clause—"the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States"—was to confirm on the citizens of each State a general citizenship, and communicated all the privileges and immunities which a citizen of the same State would be entitled to under the same circumstances. (Story on the Constitution, vol. 2, p. 605.)

In the case of the *Bank of the United States vs. Primrose*, in the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Webster said:

That this article in the Constitution (art. 4., sec. 2) does not confer on the citizens of each State political rights in every other State, is admitted. A citizen of Pennsylvania cannot go into Virginia and vote at any election in that State, though when he has acquired a residence in Virginia, and is otherwise qualified and is required by the constitution (of Virginia), he becomes, without formal adoption as a citizen of Virginia, a citizen of that State politically. (Webster's Works, vol. 6, p.112.)

It must be obvious that Mr. Webster was of opinion that the privileges and immunities of citizens, guaranteed to them in the several States, do not include the privilege of the elective franchise otherwise than as secured by the State Constitution. For, after making the statement above quoted, that a citizen of Pennsylvania cannot go into Virginia and vote, Mr. Webster adds, "but for the purpose of trade, commerce, buying and selling, it is evidently not in the power of any State to impose any hindrance or embarrassment, &c., upon citizens of other States, or to place them, going there, upon a different footing from her own citizens."(Ib.)

The proposition is clear no citizen of the United States can rightfully vote in any State of this Union who has not the qualification required by the Constitution of the State in which the right is claimed to be exercised, except as to such conditions in the constitutions of such State as deny the right to vote to citizens resident therein "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

The adoption of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution imposing these three limitations upon the power of the several States, was by necessary implication, a declaration that the States had the power to regulate by a uniform rule the condition upon which the elective franchise should be exercised by citizens of the United States resident therein. The limitation specified in the fifteenth amendment exclude the conclusion that a State of this Union, having a government republican in form, may not prescribe condition upon which alone citizens may vote other than those prohibited. It can hardly be said that a State law which exclude from voting women citizens, minor citizens, and non-resident citizens of the United States, on account of sex, minority or domicil, is a denial of the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

It may be further added that the second section of the fourteenth amendment, by the provision that "when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors of President and Vice-President of the United States, Representative in Congress, or executive and judicial of the State, or the members of the legislative thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, a citizen of the United States, or in any way abridged for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State," implies that the several States may restrict the elective franchise, to every provision of Constitution Article 1, Section 2, of the Constitution provides:

That the House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

This provision has always been construed to vest in the several States the elective right to prescribe the qualification of electors for the most numerous branch of the State 98 legislature, and therefore for members, of Congress. And this interpretation is supported by section 4, article 1, of the Constitution, which provides—

That the time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the place of choosing Senators.

Now it is submitted, if it had been intended that Congress should prescribed the qualifications of electors, that the grant would have read: The Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, and also prescribe the qualifications of electors, &c. The power, on the contrary, is limited exclusively to the time, place and manner, and does not extend to the qualification of the electors. This power to prescribe the qualification of electors in the several States has always been exercised, and is, to-day, by the several States of the Union; and we apprehend, until the Constitution shall be changed, will continue to be so exercised, subject only to the express limitations imposed by the Constitution upon the several States, before noticed. We are of opinion, therefore, that it is not competent for the Congress of the United States to establish by law the right to vote without regard to sex in the several States of this Union, without the consent of the people of such States, and against their constitutions and laws; and that such legislation would be, in our judgment, a violation of the Constitution of the United States, and of the rights reserved to the States respectively by the Constitution. Is it is undoubtedly the right of the people of the several States so to reform their constitutions and laws as to secure the equal exercise of the right of suffrage, at all elections held therein under the Constitution of the United States, to all citizens, without regard to sex; and as public opinion creates constitutions and governments in the several States, it is not to be doubted that whenever, in any State, the people are of opinion that such a reform is advisable, it will be made.

If, however, as is claimed in the memorial referred to, the right to vote “is vested by the Constitution in the citizens of the United States without regard to sex,” that right can be established in the courts without further legislation.

The suggestion is made that Congress, by a mere declaratory act, shall say that the construction claimed in the memorial is the true construction of the Constitution, or in other words, that by the Constitution of the United States the right to vote is vested in citizens of the United States “without regard to sex,” anything in the constitution and laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. In

the opinion of the committee, such declaratory act is not authorized by the Constitution nor within the legislative power of Congress. We therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the prayer of the petitioner be not granted, that the memorial be laid on the table, and that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

99

41st Congress,}HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.{Report No. V., 3d Session.} {Part 2. VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

February 1, 1871.—Ordered to be Printed.

Mr. Loughridge, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following as the **VIEWS OF THE MINORITY**.

In the matter of the Memorial of Victoria C. Woodhull, referred by the House to the Committee on the Judiciary, the undersigned, members of the Committee, being unable to agree to the report of the committee, present the following as their views upon the subject of the Memorial:

The memorialist sets forth that she is a native born citizen of the United States, and a resident thereof; that she is of adult age, and has resided in the State of New York for three years past; that by the Constitution of the United States she is guaranteed the right of suffrage; but that she is, by the laws of the State of New York, denied the exercise of that right; and that by the laws of different States and Territories the privilege of voting is denied to all the female citizens of the United States; and petitions for relief by the enactment of some law to enforce the provisions of the Constitutions, by which such right is guaranteed.

The question presented is one of exceeding interest and importance, involving as it does the constitutional rights not only of the memorialist but of more than one half of the citizens of the United States—a question of constitutional law in which the civil and natural rights of the citizen are involved. Questions of property or of expediency have nothing to do with it. The question is not “Would it be expedient to extend the right of suffrage to women,” but, “Have women citizens that right by the Constitution as it is.”

A question of this kind should be met fairly, and investigated in that generous and liberal spirit characteristic of the age, and decided upon principles of justice, of right, and of law.

It is claimed by many that to concede to woman the right of suffrage would be an innovation upon the laws of nature, and upon the theory and practice of the world for ages in the past, and especially as innovation upon the common law of England, which was originally the law of this country, and which is the foundation of our legal fabric.

If we were to admit the truth of this, it is yet no argument against the proposition, if the right claimed exists, and is established by the Constitution of the United States. The question is to be decided by the Constitution and the fundamental principles of our Government, and not by the usage and dogmas of the past.

It is gratifying fact that the world is advancing in political science, and gradually adopting more liberal and rational theories of government.

The establishment of this Government upon the principles of the declaration of Independence was in itself a great innovation upon the theories and practice of the world, and opened a new chapter in the history of the human race, and its progress toward perfect civil and political liberty.

But it is not admitted that the universal usage of the past has been in opposition to the exercise of political power by women. The highest positions of civil power have from time to time been filled by a women in all ages of the world, and the question of the right of woman to a voice in government is not a new one by any means, but has been agitated, and the right acknowledged and exercised, in governments far less free and liberal than ours.

100

In the Roman Republic, during its long and glorious career, women occupied a higher position, as to political rights and privileges, than in any other contemporaneous government. In England unmarried women have, by the laws of that country, always been competent to vote and to hold civil offices, if qualified in other respects; at least such is the weight of authority. In "Callis upon Sewers," an old English work, will be found a discussion of the question as to the right of women to hold office in England.

The learned and distinguished author uses the following language:

And for temporal governments I have observed women to have from time to time been admitted to the highest places; for in ancient Roman historical I find Eudocia and Theodora admitted at several times into the sole government of the empire; and here in England our late famous Queen Elizabeth, whose government was most renowned; and Semiramis governed Syria; and the Queen of the South, which came to visit Solomon, for anything that appears to the contrary, was a sole queen;

and to fall a degree lower, we have precedents that King Richard the First and King Henry the Fifth appointed by commissions their mothers to be regents of this realm in their absence in France.

But yet I will descend a step lower; and doth not our law, temporal and spiritual, admit of women to be executrices and administratrixes? And thereby they have the rule or ordering of great estates, and many times they are guardianesses in chivalry, and have hereby also the government of many great heirs in the kingdom and of their own estates.

So by these cases it appeareth that the common law of this kingdom submitted many things to their government; yet the statute of justices of the peace is like to Jethro's counsel to Moses, for there they speak of men to be justices, and thereby seemeth to exclude women; but our statute of sewers is, "Commission of sewers shall be granted by the King to such person and persons as the lords should appoint." So the word persons stands indifferently for either sex. I am of the opinion, for the authorities, reasons and causes aforesaid, that this honorable countess being put into the commission of the sewers, the same is warrantable by the law; and the ordinances and decrees made by her and the other commissions of sewers are not to be impeached for that cause of her sex.

As it is said by a recent writer:

Even a present in England the idea of women holding official station is not so strange as in the United States. The Countess of Pembroke had the office of sheriff of Westmoreland and exercised it in person. At the assizes she sat with the judges on the bench. In a reported case it is stated by counsel and assented to by the court that a woman is capable of serving in almost all the offices of the kingdom.

As to the right of women to vote by the common law of England, the authorities are clear. In the English Law Magazine for 1868-'69, vol. 26, page 120, will be found reported the case of the application of Jane Allen, who claimed to be entered upon the list of voters of the Parish of St. Giles, under the reform act of 1867, which act provides as follows: Every man shall, in and after the year 1868, be entitled to be registered as a voter, and when registered to vote for a member or members to serve in Parliament, who is qualified as follows: 1st. Is of full age and not subject to any legal incapacity, &c., &c.

It was decided by the court that the claimant had the right to be registered and to vote; that by the English law, the term man, as used in that statute, included woman. In that case the common law of England upon that question was fully and ably reviewed, and we may be excused for quoting at some length:

And as to what has been said of there being no such adjudged cases, I must say that it is perfectly clear that not perhaps in either of three cases reported by Mr. Shaen, but in those of Catharine vs. Surry, Coates vs. Lyle, and Holt vs. Lyle, three cases of somewhat greater antiquity, the right of women freeholders was allowed by the courts. These three cases were decided by the judges in the reign of James I (A.D. 1612). Although no printed report of them exists, I find that in the case of Olive vs. Ingraham, they were repeatedly cited by the lord chief justice of the Kings Bench in the course of four great arguments in that case, the case being reargued three times (7 Mod., 264), and the greatest respect was manifested by the whole court of those precedents. Their importance is all the greater when we consider what the matter was upon which King James' judges sitting in Westminster Hall had to decide. It was not simply the case of a mere occupier, inhabitant, or scot or lot voter. Therefore the question did not turn upon the purport of a special custom, or a charter, or a local act of Parliament, or even of the common right in this or that borough. But it was that very matter and question which has been mooted in the dietum of Lord Coke, the freeholder's franchise in the shire, and upon that the decision in each case expressly was, that a feme sole, shall vote if she hath a freehold, and that if she be not a feme sole, but a feme covert having freehold, then her husband during her coverture shall vote in her right. These, then, are so many express decisions which at once displace Lord Coke's unsupported assertion and declare the Law so as to constrain my judgment. It is sometimes said, when reference is made to precedents of this kind, that they have never been approved by the bar. But that cannot be said of these. Hakewell, the contemporary of Lord Coke and one of the greatest of all parliamentary lawyers then living—for even Selden and Granvil were not greater than Hakewell—left behind him the manuscript to which I have referred, with his comments on those cases.

Sir William Lee, chief justice, in his judgment in the case of Olive vs. Ingraham, expressly says that he had persued them, and that they contained the expression of Hakewell's entire approval of the principles upon which they were decided, and of the results deduced; and we have the statement of Lord Chief Justice Lee, who had carefully examined those cases, that in the case of Holt vs. Lyle, it was determined that a feme sole freeholder may claim a vote for Parliament men; but if married, her husband must vote for her.

In the case of Olive vs. Ingraham, Justice Probyn, says:

The case of Holt vs. Lyle, lately mentioned by our Lord Chief Justice, is a very strong case; *"They who pay ought to choose whom they shall pay."* And the Lord Chief Justice seemed to have assented to that general propositions, as authority for the correlative proposition that *"women, when 101 sole, had a right to vote."* At all events, there is here the strongest possible evidence that in the reign of James I, the *feme sole*, being a freeholder of a country, or what is the same thing, of a county,

of a city, or town, or borough, where, of custom, freeholders had the right to vote, not only had, but exercised the parliamentary franchise. If married, she could not vote in respect merely of her freehold, not because of the incapacities of coverture, but for this simple reason, that, by the act of marriage, which is an act of law, the title of the *feme sole* freeholder becomes vested for life in the husband. The qualification to vote was not personal, but real; consequently, her right to vote became suspended as soon and for as long as she was married. I am bound to consider that the question as to what weight is due to the dictum of my Lord Coke is entirely disposed of by those cases from the reign of James I and George II, and that the authority of the latter is unimpeached by any later authority, as the cases of *Rex. vs. Stubbs*, and *Regina vs. Aberavon*, abundantly show.

In Austey's Notes on the New Reform Act of 1867, the authorities and precedents upon the right of women to vote in England are examined and summed up, and the author concludes:

It is submitted that the weight of authority is very greatly in favor of the female right of suffrage. Indeed, the authority against it is contained in the short and hasty dictum of Lord Coke, referred to above. It was set down by him in his last and least authorities institution, and it is certain that he has been followed neither by the great lawyers of his time nor by the judicature. The principles of the law relation to the suffrage of females will be found in *Coates vs. Lyle*, *Holt vs Ingraham*, and *The King vs. Stubbs*, cases decided under the strict rules for the construction of statutes.

It cannot be questioned that from time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, unmarried women have been by the laws of England competent voters, subject to the freehold qualifications which applied alike to men and women. Married women could not vote because they were not freeholders; by the common law their property upon marriage became vested in the husband.

So that it appears that the admission of woman to participation in the affairs of government would not be so much of an innovation upon the theories and usage of the past as is by some supposed.

In England the theory was that in property representation, all property should be represented. Here the theory is that of personal representation, which of course, if carried out fully, includes the presentation of all property. In England, as we have seen, the owner of the property, whether male or female was entitled to representation, no distinction being made on account of sex. If the doctrine contended for by majority of the committee be correct, then this Government is less liberal upon this question than the government of England has been for hundreds of years, for there is in this country a large class of citizens of adult age, and owners in their own right of large amounts of property, and who pay a large proportion of the taxes to support the Government, who are denied any representation whatever, either for themselves or their property—unmarried women,

of whom it cannot be said that their interests are represented by their husbands. In their case, neither the English nor the American theory of representation is carried out, and this utter denial of representation is justified upon the ground alone that this class of citizens are woman.

Surely we cannot be so much less liberal than our English ancestors! Surely the Constitution of this Republic does not sanction an injustice so indefensible as that!

By the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, what constitutes citizenship of the United States, is for the first time declared, and who are included by the term citizen. Upon this question, before that time, there had been much discussion judicial, political and general, and no distinct and definite definition of qualification had been settled.

The people of the United States determined this question by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, which declares that—

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the law.

This amendment, after declaring who are citizens of the United States, and thus fixing but one grade of citizenship, which insures to all citizens alike all the privileges, immunities and rights accrue to the conditions, goes on in the same section and prohibits these privileges and immunities from abridgement by the States.

Whatever these “privileges and immunities” are, they attach to the female citizen equally with the male. It is implied by this amendment that they are inherent, that they belong to citizenship as such, for they are not therein specified or enumerated.

The majority of the committee hold that the privileges guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment do not refer to any other than the privileges embraced in section 2, of article 4, of the original text.

The certainly did not duly consider this unjustified statement.

Section 2. of article 4. provides for the privileges of “citizens of the *States*.” while the first section of the fourteenth amendment protects the privileges of “*citizens of the United States*” The terms citizens of the *States* and the citizens of the *United States* are by no means convertible.

A circuit court of the United States seems to hold a different view of this question from that stated by the committee.

In the case of *The Live Stock Association vs. Crescent City* (1st Abbot, 396), Justice Bradley, of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivering the opinion, uses the following language in relation to the 1st clause of the 14th amendment:

The new prohibition that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States" is not identical with the clause in the Constitution which declared that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." It embraces much more.

It is possible that those who framed the article were not themselves aware of the far-reaching character of its terms, yet if the amendment does in fact bear a broader meaning, and does extend its protecting shield over those who were never thought of when it was conceived and put in form, and does reach social evils which were never before prohibited by constitutional enactment, it is to be presumed that the American people, in giving it their *imprimatur*, understood what they were doing and meant to decree what in fact they have decreed.

The "privileges and immunities" secured by the original constitution were only such as each State gave to its own citizens * * * * but the fourteenth amendment prohibits any State from abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, whether its own citizens or any others. It not merely requires equality of privileges, but it demands that the privileges and immunities of all citizens shall be absolutely unbridged and unimpaired.

In the same opinion, after enumeration some of the "privileges" of the citizens, such as were pertinent to the case on trial, but declining to enumerate all, the court further says:

These privileges cannot be invaded without sapping the very foundation of republican government. A republican government is not merely a government of the people, but it is a free government. * *
* * It was very ably contended on the part of the defendants that the fourteenth amendment was intended only to secure to all citizens equal capacities before the law. That was at first our view of it. but it does not so read. The language is, "No State shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." What are the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States." Are they capacities merely? Are they not also rights.?

The court in this seems to intimate very strongly that the amendment was intended to secure the natural rights of citizens, as well as their equal capacities before the law.

In a case in the supreme court of Georgia, in 1869, the question was before the court whether a negro was competent to hold office in the State of Georgia. The case was ably argued on both sides, Mr. Akerman, the present Attorney General of the United States, being of counsel for the petitioner. Although the point was made and argued fully, that the right to vote and hold office were both included in the privileges and immunities of citizens, and were thus guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment, yet that point was not directly passed upon by the court, the court holding that under the laws and constitution of Georgia the negro citizen had the right claimed. In delivering the opinion, Chief Justice Brown said:

It is necessary to the decision of this case to inquire what are the "privileges and immunities" of a citizen, which are guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Whatever they may be, they are protected against all abridgement by legislation * * Whether the "privileges and immunities" of the citizen embrace political rights, including the right to hold office, I need not now inquire. If they do, that right is guaranteed alike by the Constitution of the United States and of Georgia, and is beyond the control of the legislature.

In the opinion of Justice McKay, among other proposition, he lays down the following.

2d. The rights of the people of this State, white and black, are not granted to them by the constitution thereof; the object and effect of that instrument is not to *give*, but to *restrain*, deny, regulate and guarantee rights, and all persons recognized by that constitution as citizens of the State have *equal, legal and political rights*, except as *otherwise expressly declared*.

3d. It is the settled and uniform sense of the word "citizen," when need in reference to the citizens of the separate States of the United States, and to their rights as such citizens, that it describes a person entitled to very right, *legal and political*, enjoyed by any person in that State, unless there be some express exceptions made by positive law covering the particular persons, whose rights are in question.

In the course of the argument of this case, Mr. Akorman use the following language upon the point, as to whether citizenship carried with it the right to hold office:

"It may be profitable to inquire how the term (citizen) has been understood in Georgia. * * * It will be seen that men whom Georgia have been accustomed to revere believed that citizenship in Georgia with the right to hold office in the absence of position restrictions."

The majority of the committee having started out with erroneous hypothesis that the term "privileges of citizens of the United States," as used in the fourteenth amendment, means no more than the term "privileges of citizens," as used in section 2 of article 4, discuss the question thus.

"The right of suffrage was not included in the privileges of citizens as used in section 2, article 4, therefore that right is not included in the privileges of the United States, as used in the fourteenth amendment."

Their premise being erroneous their whole argument fails. But they were correct 103 in their premise, we yet claim that their second position is not sustained by the authorities, and is shown to be fallacious by a consideration of the principles of free government.

We claim that from the very nature of our government, the right of suffrage is a fundamental right of citizenship, not only included in the term "privileges of citizens of the United States," as used in the fourteenth amendment, but also included in the term as used in section 2 of article 4, and this we claim we are sustained both by the authorities and by reason.

In *Abbott vs. Bayley*, (6 Pick., 92,) the supreme court of Massachusetts says:

"The privileges and immunities" secured to the people of each State, in every other State, can be applied only to the case of a removal from one State into another. By such removal they become citizens of the adopted State without naturalization and have a right to sue and be sued as citizens; and yet this privilege is qualified and not absolute, for they cannot enjoy the right of suffrage or eligibility to office without such *term of residence* as shall be prescribed by the constitution and laws of the State into which they shall remove.

This case fully recognizes the right of suffrage as one of the "privileges of the citizen," subject to the right of the State to *regulate* as to the *term of residence* —the same principle was laid down in *Corfield vs. Correll*.

In the case of *Corfield vs. Correll* in the Supreme Court of the United States, Justice Washington, in delivering the opinion of the court, used the following language.

“The privilege and immunities conceded by the Constitution of the United States to citizens in in several States,” are to be confined to those which are in their nature fundamental, and belong of right to the citizens of all free governments. Such are the rights of protection of life and liberty, and to acquire and enjoy property, and to pay no higher impositions than other citizens, and to pass through or reside in the State at pleasure, and to enjoy the elective franchise as regulated and established by the laws or constitution of the States in which it is to be exercised.

And this is cited approvingly by Chancellor Kent. (2 Kent, see. 72)

This case is cited by the majority of the committee, as sustaining their view of the law, but we are unable se to understand it. It is for them an exceedingly unfortunate citation.

In that case the court enumerated some of the “privileges of citizens,” such as are “*in their nature fundamental and belong of right to the citizens of all free governments*,” (mark the language), and among those rights, place the “right of the elective franchise” in the same category with those great rights of life, *liberty* and *property*. And yet the committee cite this case to show that this right is *not* a fundamental right of the citizen!

But is added by the court that the right of the elective franchise, “is to be enjoyed as regulated and established by the State in which it is to be exercised.”

These words are supposed to qualify the right, or rather take it out of the list of fundamental rights, where the court had just placed it. The court is made to say by this attempt in the same sentence, “the elective franchise *is* a fundamental right of the citizen, and it is *not* a fundamental right.” It is a “fundamental right,” provided the States sees fit to grant the right. It is a “fundamental right of the citizen,” but it does not exist, unless the laws of the States give it. A singular species of “fundamental rights!” Is there not a clear distinction between the regulation of a right and its destruction? The State may regulate the right, but it may not destroy it.

What is the meaning of “regulate” and “establish?” Webster says:—Regulate—to put in good order. Establish—to make stable or firm.

This decision them, is that “the elective franchise is a fundamental right of the citizen of all free governments, to be enjoyed by the citizen, under such laws as the State may enact to regulate the right and make it stable or firm.” Chancellor Kent in the section referred to, in giving the *substance* of this opinion, leaves out the word establish, regarding the word regulate as sufficiently giving the meaning of the court.

This case is, in our opinion, a very strong one against the theory of the majority of the committee.

The committee cite the language of Mr. Webster, as counsel in *United States vs. Primrose*.

We indorse every word in that extract. We do not claim that a citizen of Pennsylvania can go into Virginia and vote in Virginia, being a citizen of Pennsylvania. No person has ever contended for such an absurdity. We claim that when the citizen of the United States becomes a citizen of Virginia, that the State of Virginia has neither right nor power to abridge the privileges of such citizen by denying him entirely the right of suffrage, and thus all political rights. The authorities cited by the majority of the committee do not seem to meet the case—certainly do not sustain their theory.

The case of *Cooper vs. The Mayor of Savannah*, (4 Geo., 72) involved the question whether a free negro was a citizen of the United States? The court, in the opinion says:

Free persons of color have never been recognized as citizen of Georgia; they are not entitled to bear arms, vote for members of the legislature, or hold any civil office; they have no political rights, but have personal rights, one of which is personal liberty.

104

That they could not vote, hold office, &c., was held evidence that they were not regarded as citizens.

In the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Scott vs. Sanford*, 19 Howard, p.476,) Mr. Justice Daniel, in delivering his opinion, used the following language as to the rights and qualities of citizenship:

For who it may be asked is a citizen? What do the character and status of citizens import? Without fear of contradictions, it does not import the condition of being private property, the subject of individual power and ownership. Upon a principle of etymology alone, the term citizen, as derived from *civitas*, conveys the idea of connection or identification with the State or government, and a participation in its functions. But beyond that there is not, it is believed to be found, in the theories of writers on government, or in any actual experiment heretofore tried, an exposition of the term citizen which has not been understood as conferring the actual possession and enjoyment, or the perfect right of acquisition and enjoyment, of an entire equality of privileges, civil and political.

And in the same case Chief Justice Taney said: "The words 'people of the United States' and 'citizens' are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing; they both describe the political body, who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power, and conduct the Government through their representative. They are what we familiarly call the sovereign people,

and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty." (19 Howard, 404.)

In an important case in the Supreme Court of the United States, Chief Justice Jay, in delivering the opinion of the court, said: "At the Revolution the sovereignty devolved on the people, and they re truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects, (unless the African saves may be so called,) and have none to govern but themselves. The citizens of America are equal as fellow-citizens, and joint tenants of the sovereignty." (*Chishol vs. Georgia*, 2 Dallas, 470.)

I *Conner vs. Elliott*, (18 Howard,) Justice Curtis, in declining to give an enumeration of all the "privileges" of the citizen, said "According to the express words and clear meaning to the clause, no privileges are secured except those that belong to citizenship.

The Supreme Court said, in *Corfield vs. Coryell*, that the elective franchise is such privilege; therefore, according to Justice Curtis, it belongs to citizenship. In a case in the Supreme court of Kentucky, (1 *Littell's Ky. Reports*, p. 333,) the court say:

No one can, therefore, in the correct sense of the term be a citizen of a State who is not entitled up in the terms described by the institutions of the State to all the rights and privileges conferred by these institutions upon the highest class of society.

Mr. Wirt, when Attorney General of the United States, in an official opinion to be found on p. 508, 1st volume *Opinions of Attorney Generals*, came to the conclusion that the negroes were not citizens of the United States, for the reason that they had very few of the "privileges" of citizens, and among the "privileges of citizens" of which they were deprived, that they could not vote at any election.

Webster defines a citizen to be a person, native or naturalized, who has the privilege of voting for public officers, and who is qualified to fill offices in the gift of the people.

Worcester defines the word thus: "An inhabitant of a republic who enjoys the rights of a citizen or freeman, and who has a right to vote for public officer as a citizen of of the United States."

Bouvier, in his *Law Dictionary*, defines the term Citizen thus: "One who, under the Constitutional and laws of the United States, has a right to vote for Representative in Congress and other public officers, and who is qualified to fill offices in the gift of the people.

Aristotle defines a "citizen" to be one who is a *partner in the legislative and judicial power*, and who shares in the honors of the state." (*Aristotle de Repub.*, hb. 3, ap. 5, D.)

The essential properties of Athenian citizenship consisted is the share possessed by every citizen in the legislature, in the election of magistrates and in the courts of justice. (See Smith's Dictionary of Greek Antiquities, p. 289.)

The possession of the *jus suffragii*, at least, if not also of the *jus honorum*, is the principle which governs at this day in defining citizenship in the countries deriving their jurisprudence from the civil law. (Wheaton's International Law, p. 892.)

The Dutch publicist, Thorbecke, says:

What constitutes the distinctive character of our epoch is the development of the right of citizenship. In its most extended, as well as its most restricted sense, is includes a great may properties.

The right of citizenship is the right of voting in the government of the local, provincial or national community of which one is a member. In this last sense the right of citizenship signifies a participation in the right of voting, in the general government, as member of the State.

(Rev. & Fr. Etr., tom. v, p. 883.)

In a recent work of some research, written in opposition to female suffrage, the 105 author takes the ground that women are not citizens, and urges that as a reason why they can properly be denied the elective franchise, his theory being that if full citizens they would be entitled to the ballot. He uses the following language:

It is a question about which there may be some diversity of opinion what constitutes citizenship or who are citizens. In a loose and improper sense the word citizen is sometimes used to devote any inhabitant of the country, but this is not a correct use of the word. Those, and no others, are properly citizens who were parties to the original compact by which the government was formed, or their successors who are qualified to take part in the affairs of government by their votes in the election of puotic officers.

Women and children are represented by their domestic directors or heads in whose wills theirs is supposed to be included. They, as well as others not entitled to vote, are not properly citizens, but are members of the State, fully entitled to the protection of its laws. A citizen, then, is a person entitled to vote in the elections. He is one of those in whom the sovereign power of the State resides. (Jones on Suffrage, p. 48.)

But all such fallacious theories as this are swept away by the fourteenth amendment, which abolishes the theory of different grades of citizenship, or different grades of rights and privileges, and declares all persons born in the country or naturalized in it to be citizens, in the broadest and fullest sense of the term, leaving no room for cavil, and guaranteeing to all citizens the rights and privileges of citizens of the republic.

We think we are justified in saying that the weight of authority sustains us in the view we take of this question. But considering the nature of it, it is a question depending much for its solution upon a consideration of the government under which citizenship is claimed. Citizenship in Turkey or Russia is essentially different in its rights and privileges from citizenship in the United States. In the former, citizenship means no more than the right to the protection of his absolute rights, and the “citizen” is a subject; nothing more. Here, in the language of Chief Justice Jay, there are no subjects. All, native-born and naturalized, are citizens of the highest class; here *all citizens are sovereigns*, each citizen bearing a portion of the supreme sovereignty, and therefore it must necessarily be that the right to a voice in the Government is the right and privilege of a citizen as such, and that which is undefined in the Constitution is undefined because it is self-evident.

Could a State disfranchise and deprive of the right to a vote all citizens who have red hair; or all citizens under six feet in height? All will consent that the States could not make such arbitrary distinctions the ground for denial of political privileges; that it would be a violation of the first article of the fourteenth amendment; that it would be abridging the privileges of citizens. And yet the denial of the elective franchise to citizens on account of sex is equally as arbitrary as the distinction on account of stature, or color of hair, or any other physical distinction.

These privileges of the citizen exist independent of the Constitution. They are not derived from the Constitution or the laws, but are the means asserting and protecting rights that existed before any civil governments were formed—the right of life, liberty and property. Says Paine, in his *Dissertation upon the Principles of Government*:

The right of voting for representatives is the primary right, by which other rights are protected. To take away this right is to reduce man to a state of slavery, for slavery consists in being subject to the will of another; and he that has not a vote in the election of representatives is, in this case. The proposal, therefore, to disfranchise any class of men is as criminal as the proposal to take away property.

In a state of nature, before governments were formed, each person possessed the natural right to defend his liberty, his life and his property from the aggressions of his fellow men. When he

enters into the free government he does not surrender that right, but agrees to exercise it, not by brute force, but by the ballot, by his individual voice in making the laws that dispose of, control and regulate those rights.

The right to a voice in the government is but the natural right protection of one's life, liberty and property, by personal strength and brute force, so modified as to be exercised in the form of a vote, through the machinery of a free government.

The right of self-protection, it will not be denied, exists in all equally in a state of nature, and the substitute for it exists equally in all the citizens after a free government is formed, for the free government is by all and for all.

The people "ordained and established" the Constitution. Such is the language of the preamble. "We, the people." Can it be said that the people acquire their privileges from the instrument that they themselves establish? Does the creature extend rights, privileges, and immunities to the creator? No; the people retain all the rights which they have not surrendered; and if the people have not given to the Government the power to deprive them of their elective franchise, they possess it by virtue of citizenship.

The true theory of this Government, and of all free governments, was laid down by our fathers in the Declaration of Independence, and declared to be "self-evident." "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; among these are 106 life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving all their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Here is the great truth, the vital principle, upon which our Government is founded, and which demonstrates that the right of a voice in the conduct of the government, and the selection of the rulers, is a right and privilege of all citizens.

Another of the self-evident truths laid down in that instruments is:

That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

How can the people carry out this right without the exercise of the ballot; and is not the ballot then a fundamental right and a privilege of the citizen, not given to him by the Constitution, but inherent, as a necessity, from the very nature of government?

Benjamin Franklin wrote:

That every man of the commonalty, except infants, insane person, and criminals, its, of common right, and by the laws of God, a freeman, and entitled to the free enjoyment of liberty. *That liberty or freedom consists in having an actual share in the appointment of those who frame the laws, and who are to be the guardians of every man; life, property, and peace, for the ail of one man is as dear to him as the all of another, and the poor man has an equal right but more need to have representatives in the legislature than the rich one. That they who have no voice nor vote in the electing or representatives do not enjoy liberty, but are absolutely enslaved to those who have votes and to their representatives; for to ne enslaved is to have governors whom other men have set over us, and be subject to laws made by the representatives of others, without having had representatives of our own to give consent in our behalf,— Franklin's Works, vol. 2. p. 372.*

James Madison said:

Under every view of the subject it seems indispensable that the mass of the citizens should not be without a voice in making the laws which they are to obey, and in choosing the magistrates who are to administer them.— *Madison Papers*, vol. 3, p.14.

Taxation without representation is abhorrent to every principle of natural or civil liberty. It was this injustice that drove our fathers into revolution against the mother country.

The very act of taxing exercised over those who are not represented appears to me to be depriving them of one of their most essential rights as freemen, and if continued seems to be, in effect, an entire disfranchisement of every civil right. For what one civil right is worth a rush after a man's property is subject to be taken from him at pleasure without his consent? If a man is not his own assessor, in person or by deputy, his liberty is gone, or he is entirely at the mercy of others— *Otis's Rights of the colonies*, p. 53.

Nor are these principles original with the people of this country. Long before they were ever uttered on this continent they were declared by Englishmen. Said Lord Summers, a truly great lawyer of England:

Amongst all the rights and privileges appertaining unto us, that of having a share in the legislation, and being governed by such laws as we ourselves shall cause, is the most fundamental and essential, as well as the most advantageous and beneficial.

Said the learned and profound Hooker:

By the natural law whereunto Almighty God hath made all subject, the lawful power of making laws to command whole politic societies of men, belongeth so properly unto the same entire societies, that for any prince or potentate of what kind soever upon earth to exercise the same of himself, (for themselves,) and not either by express commission immediately received from God, or else by authority derived at the first from their consent upon whose person they impose laws, it is no better than mere tyranny! Agreeable to the same just privilege of natural equity is that maxim for the English constitution, that "Law to bind all must be assented to by all;" and there can be no legal appearance of assent without some degree of representation.

The great champions of liberty, Granville sharpe, declared that—

All British subjects, whether in Great Britain, Ireland, or the colonies, are equally *free* by the laws of nature; they certainly are equally entitled to the same natural rights that are essential for their own preservation, because this privilege of "having a share in the legislation" is not merely a *British right*, peculiar to this island, but it is also a natural right, which cannot without the most flagrant and stimulating injustice be withdrawn from any part of the British empire *by any worldly* authority whatsoever.

No tax can be levied without manifest robbery and injustice where this legal and constitutional representation is wanting, because the English law abhors the idea of taking the least property from freemen without their free consent.

It is iniquitous (*iniquum est*, says the maxim) that freemen should not have the free disposal of their own effects, and whatever is iniquitous can never be made lawful by any authority on earth, not even by the united authority of king, lords, and common, for that would be contrary to the eternal laws of God, which are supreme.

In an essay upon the "first principles of government," by Priestly, an English writer of great ability, written over a century since, is the following definition of political liberty:

Political liberty I would say, consists in power, which the members of the state reserve to themselves, of arriving at the public offices, or at least of having votes in the nomination of those who fill them.

Un countries where every member of the society enjoys an equal power of arriving at the supreme 107 offices, and consequently of directing the strength and sentiments of the whole community, there is a state of the most perfect political liberty.

On the other hand, in countries where a man is excluded from these offices, or from the power of voting for proper persons to fill them, *that man*, whatever be the form of the government, has no share in the government and therefore has no political liberty at all. And since every man retains and can never be deprived of his natural right of relieving himself from all oppression, that is, from everything that has been imposed upon him without his own consent, this must be the only true and proper foundation of all the governments consisting in the world, and that to which the people who compose them have an inalienable right to bring them back.

It was from these great champions of liberty in England that our forefathers received their inspiration and the principles which they adopted, incorporated into the Declaration of Independence, and made the foundation and framework of our Government. And yet it is claimed that we have a Government which tramples upon these elementary principles of political liberty, in denying to one-half its adult citizens all political liberty, and subjecting them to the tyranny of taxation without representation. It cannot be.

When we desire to construe the Constitution, or to ascertain the powers of the Government and the rights of the citizens, it is legitimate and necessary to recur to those principles and make them the guide in such investigation.

It is an oft-repeated maxim set forth in the bills of rights of many of the State constitutions that "the frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is necessary for the preservation of liberty and good government."

Recurring to those principles, so plain, so natural, so like political axioms, it would seem that to say that one-half the citizens of this republican Government simply and only on account of their sex, can legally be denied the right to a voice in the Government, the laws of which they are held to obey, and which takes from their property by taxation, is so flagrantly in opposition to the principles of free government, and the theory of political liberty, that no man could seriously advocate it.

But it is said in opposition to the "citizens right" of suffrage that at the time of the establishment of the Constitution, women were in all the States denied the right of voting, and that no one claimed at the time that the Constitution of the United States would change their status; that if such a change was intended it would have been explicitly declared in the Constitution or at least carried into

practice by those who framed the Constitution, and, therefore, such a construction of it is against what must have been the intention of the framers.

This is a very unsafe rule of construction. As has been said, the Constitution necessarily deals in general principles; these principles are to be carried out to their legitimate conclusion and result by legislation, and we are to judge of the intention of those who established the Constitution by what they say, guided by what they declare on the face of the instrument to be their object.

It is said by Judge Story, in *Story on Constitution*, "Contemporary construction is properly resorted to to illustrate and confirm the text. * * *It can never abrogate the text; it can never fritter away its obvious sense; it can never narrow down its true limitations.*"

It is a well-settled rule that in the construction of the Constitution, the objects for which it was established, being expressed in the instrument, should have great influence; and when words and phrases are used which are capable of different constructions, that construction should be given which is the most consonant with the declared objects of the instrument.

We go to the preamble to ascertain the objects and purpose of the instrument. Webster defines preamble thus: "The introductory part of a statute, which states the reason and intent of the law."

In the preamble, then, more certainly than in any other way, aside from the language of the instrument, we find the intent.

Judge Story says:

The importance of examining the preamble for the purpose of expounding the language of a statute has been long felt and universally conceded in all juridical discussion. It is an admitted maxim * * that the preamble is a key to open the mind of the matters as to the mischiefs to be remedied and the objects to be accomplished by the statute. * * It is properly resorted to where doubts or ambiguities arise upon the words of the enacting part, for if they are clear and unambiguous, there seems little room for interpretation, except in cases leading to an obvious absurdity or to a direct overthrow of the intention expressed in the preamble. (*Story on the Constitution*, sec. 457.)

Try this question by a consideration of the objects for which the Constitution was established, as set forth in the preamble, "to establish justice." Does it establish justice to deprive of all representation or voice in the Government one-half of its adult citizens and compel them to pay taxes to and support a Government in which they have no representation? Is "taxation without representation" justice established?

"To insure domestic tranquility." Does it insure domestic tranquility to give all the political power to one class of citizens, and deprive another class of any participation in the government? No. The sure means of tranquillity is to give "equal political rights to all," that all may stand "equal before the law."

"To provide for the common defense." We have seen that the only defense the citizen has against oppression and wrong is by his voice and vote in the selection of the rulers and law makers. Does it, then, "provide for the common defense," to deny to one half the adult citizens of the republic that voice and vote?

"To secure the *blessings of liberty* to ourselves and our posterity." As has been already said, *there can be no political liberty to any citizen deprived of a voice in the government*. This is self-evident; it needs no demonstration. Does it, then, "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," to deprive one half the citizens of adult age of this right and privilege?

Tried by the expressed objects for which the Constitution was established, as declared by the people themselves, this denial to the women citizens of the country of the right and privilege of voting is directly in contravention of these objects, and must, therefore, be contrary to the spirit and letter of the entire instrument.

And according to the rule of construction referred to, no "contemporaneous construction, however universal it may be, can be allowed to set aside the expressed objects of the makers, as declared in the instrument." The construction which we claim for the 1st section of the fourteenth amendment is in perfect accord with those expressed objects; and even if there were anything in the original text of the Constitution at variance with the true construction of that section, the amendment must control. Yet we believe that there is nothing in the original text at variance with what we claim to be the true construction of the amendment.

It is claimed by the majority of the committee that the adoption of the fifteenth amendment was by necessary implication a declaration that the States had the power to deny the right of suffrage to citizens for any other reasons than those of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

We deny that the fundamental rights of the American citizen can be taken away by "implication."

There is no such law for the construction of the Constitution of our country. The law is the reverse—that the fundamental rights of citizens are not to be taken away by implication, and a constitutional

provision for the protection of one class can certainly not be used to destroy or impair the same rights in another class.

It is too violent a construction of an amendment, which prohibits States from, or the United States from, abridging the right of a citizen to vote, by reason of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, to say that by implication it conceded to the States the power to deny that right for any other reason. On that theory the States could confine the right of suffrage to a small minority, and make the State government aristocratic, overthrowing their republican form.

The fifteenth article of amendment to the Constitution clearly recognizes the right to vote, as one of the rights of a citizen of the United States. This is the language:

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”

Here is stated, first, the existence of a *right*. Second, its nature. Whose right is it? The right of citizens of the United States. What is the right? The right to vote. And this right of citizens of the United States, States are forbidden to abridge. Can there be a more direct recognition of a right? Can that be *abridged* which does not *exist*? The denial of the power to abridge the right, recognizes the existence of the right. It is said that this right exists by virtue of State citizenship, and State laws and Constitutions? Mark the language: “The right of citizens of the *United States* to vote;” not citizens of *States*. The right is recognized as existing independent of State citizenship.

But it may be said, if the States had no power to abridge the right of suffrage, why the necessity of prohibiting them?

There may not have been a necessity; it may have been done through caution, and because the peculiar condition of the colored citizens at that time rendered it necessary to place their rights beyond doubt or cavil.

It is laid down as a rule of construction by Judge Story that the natural import of a single clause is not to be narrowed so as to exclude implied powers resulting from its character simply because there is another clause which enumerates certain powers which might otherwise be deemed implied powers within its scope, for in such cases we are not to assume that the affirmative specification excludes all other implications. (2d Story on Constitution, sec. 449.)

There are numerous instances in the Constitution where a general power is given to Congress, and afterward a particular power given, which was included in the former; yet the general power is not

to be narrowed, because the particular power is given. On 109 this name principle the fact that by the fifteenth amendment the States are specifically forbidden to deny the right of suffrage on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, does not narrow the general provision in the fourteenth amendment which guarantees the privileges of all the citizens against abridgment by the States on any account.

The rule of interpretation relied upon by the committee in their construction of the fifteenth amendment is, "that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another," or the specification of particulars is the exclusion of generals.

Of these maxims Judge Story says:

They are susceptible of being applied, and often are ingeniously applied, to the subversion of the text and the objects of the instrument. The truth is, in order to ascertain how far an affirmative or negative provision excludes or implies others, we must look to the nature of the provision, the subject-matter, the objects, and the scope of the instrument; these and these only can properly determine the rule of construction. (2 Story, 448.)

It is claimed by the committee that the second section of the fourteenth amendment implies that the several States may restrict the right of suffrage as to other than male citizens. We may say of this as we have said of the theory of the committee upon the effect of the fifteenth amendment. It is a proposal to take away from the citizens guarantees of fundamental rights, by implication, which have been previously give in absolute terms.

The first section includes all citizens in its guarantees, and includes all the "privileges and immunities" of citizenship and guards them against abridgment, and under no recognized or reasonable rule of construction can it be claimed that by implication from the provisions of the second section the States may not only abridge but entirely destroy one of the highest privileges of the citizen to one half the citizens of the country. What we have said in relation to the committee's construction of the effect of the fifteenth amendment applies equally to this.

The object of the first section of this amendment was to secure all the rights, privileges, and immunities of all the citizens against invasion by the States. The object of the second section was to fix a rule or system of apportionment for Representatives and taxation; and the provision referred to, in relation to the exclusion of males from the right of suffrage, might be regarded as in the nature of a penalty in case of denial of that right to that class. While it, to a certain extent, protected that class of citizens, it left the others where the previous provisions of the constitution placed them. To

protect the colored man more fully than was done by that penalty was the object of the fifteenth amendment.

In no event can it be said to be more than the recognition of an existing fact, that only the male citizens were, by the State laws, allowed to vote, and that existing order of things was recognized in the rule of representation, just as the institution of slavery was recognized in the original Constitution, in the article fixing the basis of representation, by the provision that only three-fifths of all the slaves ("other person") should be counted. There slavery was recognized as an existing fact, and yet the Constitution never sanctioned slavery, but, on the contrary, had it been carried out according to its true construction, slavery could not have existed under it; so that the recognition of facts in the Constitution must not be held to be a sanction of what is so recognized.

The majority of the committee say that this section implies that the States may deny suffrage to others than male citizens. If it implies anything it implies that the States may deny the franchise to all the citizens. It does not provide that they shall not deny the right to male citizens, but only provides that if they do so deny they shall not have representation for them.

So, according to the argument, by the second section of the fourteenth amendment the power of the States is conceded to entirely take away the right of suffrage, even from that privileged class, the male citizens. And thus this rule of "implication" goes too far, and fritters away all the guarantees of the Constitution of the right of suffrage, the highest of the privileges of the citizen; and herein is demonstrated the reason and safety of the rule that fundamental rights are not to be taken away by implication, but only by express provision.

When the advocates of a privileges class of citizens under the Constitution are driven to implication to sustain the the theory of taxation without representation, and American citizenship without political liberty, the cause must be weak indeed.

It is claimed by the majority that by section 2, article 1, the Constitution recognizes the power in States to declare who shall and who shall not exercise the elective franchise. That section reads as follows:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature.

The first clause of this section declares *who* shall choose the Representative—mark the language —“Representative *shall be chosen by the people* of the States,” not by the male people, not by certain classes of the people, but by the people; so that the construction sought to be given this section, by which it would recognize the power of the State to disfranchise one-half the citizens, as in direct contravention of the first clause of the section, and of its whole spirit, as well as of the objects of the instrument. The States clearly have no power to nullify the express provisions that the election shall be by the people, by any laws limiting the elections to a moiety of the people.

It is true the section recognize the power in the State to regulate the qualifications of the electors; but as we have already said, the power to regulate is a very different thing from the power to destroy.

The two clauses must be taken together, and both considered in connection with the declared purpose and objects of the constitution.

The Constitution is necessarily confined to the statement of general principles. There are regulations necessary to be made as to the qualifications of votes, as to their proper age, their domicile, the length or residence necessary to entitle in the Constitution but are necessarily left to the States, and this section is thus construed as to be in harmony with itself, and with the expressed objects of the framers of the Constitution and the principle of free government.

When the majority of the committee can demonstrate that “the people of the States,” and one-half the people of the States, are equivalent terms, or that when the Constitution provides that the Representatives shall be closed by the people, its requirements are met by an election in which less than one-half the adult people are allowed to vote, than it will admitted that this section, to some extent sustains them.

The committee say, that if it had been intended that Congress should prescribe the qualification of electors, the grant would have given Congress that power specifically. We do not claim that Congress has that power; on the contrary, admit that the States have it; but the section of the Constitution *does* prescribe who the electors shall be. That is what we claim—nothing more. They shall be “the people;” their qualifications may be regulated by the States; but the claim of the majority of the committee that they may be “qualified” out of we cannot assent.

We are told that the acquiescence by the the adoption of the Constitution, in the denial of political rights to woman and the general understanding that such denial was in conformity with the , should be taken to settle the construction of that instrument.

Any force this argument may have it can only apply to the original text, and not to the fourteenth amendment, which is of but recent date.

But, as a general principle, this theory is fallacious. It would stop all political progress; it would put an end to all original thought, and put the people under that tyranny with which the friends of liberty have always had to contend—the tyranny of precedent.

From the beginning, our Government has been right in theory, but wrong in practice. The Constitution, had it been carried out in its true spirit, and its principle enforced, would have stricken the chains from every slave in the reputable long since. Yet, for all this, it was but a few years since declared, by the highest judicial tribunal of the republic, that, according to the “general understanding,” the black man in this country had no rights the white man was bound to respect. General understanding and acquiescence is a very unsafe rule by which to try questions of constitutional law, and precedence are not infallible guides toward liberty and the rights of man.

Without any law to authorize it, slavery existed in England, and was sustained and perpetuated by popular opinion, universal custom, and the acquiescence of all departments of the government as well as by the subjects of its oppression. A few fearless champions of liberty struggled against the universal sentiment, and contended that, by the laws of England slavery could not exist in the kingdom; and though for years unable to obtain a hearing in any British court, the *Sommersett* case was finally tried in the Court of King's Bench in 1771, Lord Mansfield presiding, wherein that great and good man, after a long and patient hearing, declared that no law of England allowed or approved of slavery, and discharged the negro. And it was then judicially declared that no slave could breathe upon the soil of England, although slavery had up to that time existed for centuries, under the then existing laws. The laws were right, but the practice and public opinion were wrong.

It is said by the majority of the committee that “if the right of female citizens to suffrage as vested by the Constitution, that right can be established in the courts.”

We respectfully submit that, with regard to the competency and qualification of electors for members of this House, the courts have no jurisdiction.

111

This House is the sole judge of the election return and qualification of its own members, (article 1, section 5, of Constitution;) and it is for the House alone to decide upon a contest, who are, and who are not, competent and qualified to vote. The judicial department cannot thus invade the prerogative of the political department.

And it is therefore perfectly proper, in our opinion, for the House to pass a declaratory resolution, which would be an index to the action of the House, should the question be brought before it by a contest for a seat.

We, therefore, recommend to the House the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, by the House of Representatives, That the right of suffrage is one of the inalienable rights of citizens of the United States, subject to regulation by the States, through equal and just laws.

That the right is included in the "privileges of citizens of the United States," which are guaranteed by section 1 of article 14 of amendments to the Constitution of the United States; and that women citizens, who are otherwise qualified by the laws of the State where they reside, are competent voters for Representative in Congress.

WM. LOUGHRIDGE. BENJ. F. BUTLER

H. Rep. 22, pt. 2—2

112

**THE NEW REBELLION. -The Great Secession Speech OF VICTORIA C. WOODHULL, BEFORE
THE National Woman's Suffrage Convention, AT Apollo Hall, May 11, 1871.**

Since this is not a convention for the consideration of general political questions, I am not certain that I have any thing to say which will prove of interest or profit to you. But with your permission I will endeavor to state the position which the movement for political equality now occupies, and attempt to show therefrom the duties which devolve upon those who advocate it.

Whatever there may have been spoken, written or thought in reference to the constitutional rights of women citizens of the United States, as defined by the XIV. and XV. Articles of Amendments to the Supreme Law of the Land, the first practical movement under it to secure their exercise was made in the Congress of the United States during the past winter. A memorial setting forth the grievances of a woman citizen, who was denied the right of citizenship, was introduced into both Houses of Congress, and by them referred to their Judiciary Committees. Upon this memorial the House Judiciary Committee made two reports; that of the majority while admitting the validity of the Foundation upon which the memorial was based, was adverse to congressional action thereon, naively attempts to ignore the force of the argument by thrusting the responsibility back upon the States, which have acted upon the point in question by the adoption of said Amendments. That of

the 113 minority, than whom here is no more conclusive judiciary authority in the United States, tool issue with the entire pleading of the majority, and fortified their position by such an array of authority, judicial decisions and logic, as to fully establish the fact of the right of women to the elective franchise in every unprejudiced mind.

So forcible was the conviction which this report carried wherever analyzed, that even democrats who, everybody well knows, are constitutionally predisposed against the extension of suffrage, acknowledged it as unanswerable. Besides this, there has been so much high judicial authority also expressing itself in the same terms of approbation, there can be no question whatever about the fact that women, equally with men, are entitled to vote. The conclusion, though at first received with great skepticism by very many who wished it were really so, is gradually spreading among the people, and settling into a well defined conviction in their hearts. Many of your own journals even ridiculed the matter, more I presume from dislike to the movers in it than from convictions of its incapacity to meet the required demand.

I am glad, however, to now announce that most of these journals have reconsidered the subject, since there has been such enthusiasm and action raised all over the country by it, resulting in bringing women forward to demand their rights which have been accorded to them in a sufficient number of cases to finally decide the true value of the movement. If I mistake not some of those who were instrumental in preventing the exercise of these claimed rights will have the pleasure of paying for their presumption in money, if not by imprisonment, both of which may be meted to them under the act which it seems was almost providentially passed by Congress in May, 1870, to meet just cases as are now required to be met.

There are two ways by which the success already gained may be pushed on to ultimate and complete victory, both of which I count as legitimate and justifiable. One is to continue the appeals to the courts, until by a final decision of the Supreme Court, it shall be fully determined. The other is for Congress to pass an act declaring the equal rights of all citizens to the elective franchise. To this method some object that it stultifies the position that the Constitution already grants every thing we ask. But these objectors forget that by Par. 17, 114 Sec. VIII, Article 1 of this same Constitution it is made one of the duties of Congress to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all powers vested by the constitution in the Government of the United States, and that one of the special powers vested in Congress is the right to make *all* laws necessary for enforcing the provisions of the XIV and XV Amendments. It seems to me that petitioning Congress to enforce the provisions of these Amendments is eminently proper, and that any who object thereto either do not understand the powers and duties of Congress or do not wish so easy a solution of the

franchise question, which solution cannot be expected from the courts, as a decision therein may be deferred for years.

A Washington correspondent of the Tribune of May 2d, speaking of this matter, says:

"There is no probability that the women of this District will vote by the next Presidential election, if they depend on a decision of the Courts in their favor for the privilege. The action is brought in the Circuit Court of the District, which will adjourn before reaching the case. It cannot then, be decided until the October term; but, no matter what the decision may be, the case will be appealed to the United States Supreme Court, which, judging from the present condition of its docket, will not be able to render an opinion in less than two or three years."

The matter of time is an important element in this issue. I am aware that women do not yet fully appreciate the terrible power of the ballot, and that they have made no calculations what they will do should the right to vote be accorded them the next session of Congress. I hold that when women are fully decided in their minds that they are entitled by law to the elective franchise, it is their solemn duty to determine how they shall use this new power.

The enfranchisement of ten millions of women, is a revolution such as the world has never seen, and effects will follow it commensurate with its magnitude and importance. Whatever the women of the country shall determine to do that will be done. It seems to me that nothing could be more wise and judicious than for them even now to begin to consider what they will do.

I have had ample occasion to learn the true worth of present political parties, and I unhesitatingly pronounce it as my firm conviction if they rule this country twenty years to come as badly as they have for twenty years past, that our liberties will be lost, or that the parties will be washed out by such rivers of blood as the late war never produced. I do not speak this unadvisedly. I know there are men in Congress—great men—who know that unless change for the better come this will

What do the Republican leaders care for the interests of the people if they do not contribute to their strength. They have prostituted and are prostituting the whole power of the government to their own selfish purposes. They have wrung the very last possible dollar from the industries of the country and are now hoarding it in the vaults of the Treasury. One hundred and thirty millions of dollars in actual cash is a great power, a dangerous power it might be made by unscrupulous men, and I do not think but that there are those near the head of the government who are ambitious and unscrupulous enough to take advantage of any favorable opportunity in which to make use of this power.

True the republican party did a mighty work to which all future ages will look back with reverence. True that they opened the door, unwittingly though it was done, to our enfranchisement. True that they have made the name of slavery odious, and added new lustre to that of freedom.

But having delivered us from one damnation shall they be permitted to sell us to another, compared to which the first is but a cipher? They have told us that the Southern slave oligarchy had virtual control of the government for many years, and that the terrible war which we waged was the only means by which this power could be humbled.

But do they tell us of a still more formidable oligarchy which is now fastening upon the vitals of the country? Do they tell us that they have given four hundred millions of acres of the public domain, millions of dollars and tens of millions of credit to build up this new tyrant? Do they tell us that tyrant is even now sufficiently powerful to buy up the whole legislation of the country, to secure the confirmation of any nomination which it desires made, and to bribe officials everywhere to the non-performance of their duty? Do they tell us matters have been so arranged that all the revenue they can extract from the people is turned over to this power, by which process the vitality of the country is being gradually absorbed? No, not a bit of it. This they will leave us to learn through bitter experience as we were left to learn what were the fruits of forty years plotting by the slave oligarchy. This new oligarchy has plotted less than ten years and it has already attained the most threatening and alarming proportions.

Shall we turn to the Democratic party with the hope that they may prove the necessary salvation from the wrath to come. To do this would indeed be to show the dire extremity to which we are driven. I hold that the Democratic party is directly responsible for the late war. The Democratic party South would not have rebelled had not the Democratic party North promised them their support. Can we expect anything better from them than from the Republican party? They are not now making themselves so antagonistic to the true interests of the country as are the Republicans, simply because they have not got the power so to do. But where they have the power, their leaders do not hesitate to make the most use of it to their own aggrandisement.

Therefore, it is my conviction, arrived at after the most serious and careful consideration, that it will be equally suicidal for the Woman Suffragists to attach themselves to either of these parties. They must not—cannot afford to—be a mere negative element in the political strife which is sure to ensure in the next Presidential election. They must assume a positive attitude upon a basis compatible with the principles of freedom, equality and justice which their enfranchisement would so gloriously demonstrate as the true principles of a republican form of government. I do not assume to speak for any one. I know I speak in direct opposition to the wishes of many by whom

I am surrounded. Nevertheless, I should fail to do my duty, did I conceal what I feel to be the true interests of my sex, and through them, those of humanity; for the interests of humanity will never be understood or appreciated until women are permitted to demonstrate what they are, and how they shall be subserved. I have thus as briefly as possible given what I conceive to be the position which the Woman's Rights Party occupies at this time, their prospective power, importance and duties, and the dangers by which this country is threatened, from which they may save it.

117

If Congress refuse to listen to and grant what women ask, there is but one course left them to pursue. Women have no government. Men have organized a government, and they maintain it to the utter exclusion of women. Women are as much members of the nation as men are, and they have the same human right to govern themselves which men have. Men have none but an usurped right to the arbitrary control of women. Shall free, intelligent, reasoning, thinking women longer submit to being robbed of their common rights. Men fashioned a government based on their own *enunciation* of principles: that taxation without representation is tyranny; and that all just government exists by the consent of the governed. Proceeding upon *these* axioms, they formed a Constitution declaring all persons to be citizens, that one of the rights of a citizen is the right to vote, and that no power within the nation shall either make or enforce laws interfering with the citizen's rights. And yet men deny women the first and greatest of all the rights of citizenship, the right to vote.

Under such glaring inconsistencies, such unwarrantable tyranny, such unscrupulous despotism. what is there left women to do but to become the mothers of the future government.

We will have our rights. We say no longer by your leave. We have besought, argued and convinced, but we have failed; *and we will not* fail.

We will try you *just once more*. If the very next Congress refuse women all the legitimate results of citizenship; if they indeed merely so much as fail by a proper declaratory act to withdraw every obstacle to the most ample exercise of the franchise, the we give here and now, deliberate notification of what we will do next.

There is one alternative left, and we have resolved on that. This convention is for the purpose of this declaration. As surely as one year passes, from this day, and this right is not fully, frankly and unequivocally considered, we shall proceed to call another convention expressly to frame a new constitution and to erect a new government, complete in all its parts, and to take measures to maintain it as effectually as men do theirs.

If for people to govern themselves is so unimportant a matter as men now assert it to be, they could not justify themselves in interfering. 118 If, on the contrary, it is the important thing we conceive it to be, they can but applaud us for exercising our right.

We mean treason; we mean secession, and on a thousand times grander scale than was that of the South. We are plotting revolution; we will overslough this bogus republic and plant a government of righteousness in its stead, which shall not only profess to derive its power from the consent of the governed, but shall do so in reality.

We rebel against, denounce and defy this arbitrary, usurping and tyrannical government which has been framed and imposed on us without our consent, and even without so much as entertaining the idea that it was or could be of the slightest consequence what we should think of it, or how our interests should be affected by it, or even that we existed at all, except in the simple case in which we might be found guilty of some offense against its behests, when it has not failed to visit on us its sanctions with as much rigor as if we owed rightful allegiance to it; which we do not, and which, in the future, we will not even pretend to do.

This new government, if we are compelled to form it, shall be in principles largely like that government which the better inspirations of our fathers compelled them to indite in terms in the Constitution, but from which they and their sons have so scandalously departed in their legal constructions and actual practice. It shall be applicable, not to women alone, but to all persons who shall transfer their allegiance to it, and shall be in every practicable way a higher and more scientific development of the governmental idea.

We have learned the imperfections of men's government, by lessons of bitter injustice, and hope to build so well that men will desert from the less to the more perfect. And when, by our receiving justice, or by our own actions, the old and false shall be replaced by the new and true; when for tyranny and exclusiveness shall be inaugurated equality and fraternity, and the way prepared for the rapid development of social reconstruction throughout.

Because I have taken this bold and positive position; because I have advocate radical political action; because I have announced a new party and myself as a candidate for the next Presidency, I am charged with being influenced by an unwarrantable ambition. Though this is 119 scarcely the place for the introduction of a privileged question, I will, however, take this occasion to, once and for all time, state I have no personal ambition whatever. All that I have done, I did because I believed the interests of humanity would be advanced thereby.

Had I been ambitious to become the next president I should have proceeded very differently to accomplish it. I did announce myself as a candidate, and this simple fact has done a great work in compelling people to ask: and why not? This service I have rendered women at the expense of any ambition I might have had, which is apparent if the matter be but candidly considered.

In conclusion, permit me again to recur to the importance of following up the advantages we have already gained, by rapid and decisive blows for complete victory. Let us do this through the courts wherever possible, and by direct appeals to Congress during the next session. And I again declare it as my candid belief that if women will do one-half their duty until Congress meets, that they will be compelled to pass such laws as are necessary to enforce the provisions of the XIV. and XV. Articles of Amendments to the Constitution, one of which is equal political right for all citizens.

But should they fail, then for the alternative.

At the Suffrage Convention held in Apollo Hall, May 11 and 12, 1871, by request of Mrs. Lucretia Mott, the following Platform of Principles of a just government were read by Victoria C. Woodhull, and are embodied in this history that they may have a wide circulation and be deeply considered in all their bearings on the future of this country:

A NEW POLITICAL PARTY AND A NEW PARTY PLATFORM.

Suffrage is a common right of citizenship. Women have the right of suffrage. *Logically* it cannot be escaped. Syllogistically it is self-evident, thus;

First. —All persons—men and women—are citizens. Second. —Citizens have the right to vote. Third. —Women have the right to vote.

Though the right to vote be now denied, it must eventually be accorded. Women can be neither Democrats nor Republicans. They must be something more than Democratic or Republican. They must be humanitarian. They must become a positive element in governmental affairs. They have though little; they must be brought to think more. To suggest food for thought, a new party and a new platform is proposed for the consideration of women and men—the party, the Cosmopolitical—the platform a series of reforms, to wit:

40G

A reform in representation by which all Legislative Bodies and the Presidential Electoral College shall be so elected that minorities as well as majorities shall have direct representation.

A complete reform in Executive and Department conduct, by which the President and the Secretaries of the United States, and the Governors and State Officers shall be forced to recognize that they are the servants of the people, appointed to attend to the business of the people, and not for the purpose of perpetuating their official positions, or of securing the plunder of public trusts for the enrichment of their political adherents and supporters.

A reform in the tenure of office, by which the Presidency shall be limited to one term, with a retiring life pension, and a permanent seat in the Federal Senate, where his Presidential experience may become serviceable to the nation, and on the dignity and life emolument of Presidential Senator he shall be placed above all other political position, and be excluded from all professional pursuits.

A radical reform in our Civil Service, by which the Government, in its executive capacity, shall at all times secure faithful and efficient officers, and the people trustworthy servants, whose appointment shall be entirely removed from, and be made independent of, the influence and control of the legislative branch of the Government, and who shall be removed for "cause" only, and who shall be held strictly to frequent public accounting to superiors for all their official transactions, which shall forever dispose of the corrupt practices induced by the allurements of the motto of present political parties, that "to the victor belong the spoils," which is a remnant of arbitrarily assumed authority, unworthy of a government emanating from the whole people.

A reform in our systems of finance, by which the arbitrary standard of ancient and feudal despotisms shall be removed; by which the true source of wealth shall become the basis and the security of a national currency, which shall be made convertible into a National Bond bearing such an interest, while in the hands of the people, as shall secure an equilibrium between the demands of all the varieties of exchanges and the supply of money to effect them with, the Bond being also convertible at pleasure into money again, by which system of adjustment, "plethora" equally with "tightness" shall be banished from the financial centres of our country; and which, in its practical workings, shall secure such pecuniary equality between the employing and the laboring classes as will forever make poverty and its long list of consequent ills impossible in our country; and which shall suggest the solution of those schemes which are being discussed for "funding the public debt" at a lower rate of interest.

A complete reform in our system of Internal improvements, which connect and bind together the several States in commercial unity, to the end that they shall be conducted so as to administer to the best interests of the whole people, for whose benefit they were first permitted, and are now protected; by which the General Government, in the use of its postal powers, and in the exercise of its duties in regulating commerce between the States, shall secure the transportation of the country

to the opposite, and throughout its whole area, at the actual cost of maintaining such improvements, plus legitimate interest upon their original cost of construction, thus converting them into public benefits, instead of their remaining, as now, hereditary taxes upon the industries of the country, by which, if continued, a few favored individuals are likely to become the actual rulers of the country.

A complete reform in commercial and navigation laws, by which American built or purchased ships and American seamen shall be practically protected by the admission of all that is require for construction of the first, or the use and maintenance of either, free in bond or on board.

A reform in the relations of the employer and employed, by which shall be secured the practice of the great natural law, of one-third of time to labor, one-third to recreation and one-third to rest, that by this, intellectual improvement and physical development may go on to that perfection which the Almighty Creator designed.

A reform in the principles of protection and revenue, by which the largest home and foreign demand shall be created and sustained for products of American industry of every kind; by which this industry shall be freed from the ruinous effects consequent upon frequent changes in these systems; by which shall be secured that constant employment to workingmen and workingwomen throughout the country which will maintain them upon an equality in all kinds and classes of industry; by which a continuous property—which, if not so marked by rapid accumulation, shall possess the merit of permanency—will be secured to all, which in due time will reduce the cost of all products to a minimum value; by which the laboring poor shall be relieved of the onerous tax now indirectly imposed upon them by government; by which the burden of governmental support shall be placed where it properly belongs, and by which an unlimited national wealth will gradually accumulate, 401 the of taxation upon which will become so insignificant in amount as to be no burden to the people.

A reform by which the power of legislative bodies to levy taxes shall be limited to the actual necessities of the legitimate functions of government in its protection of the rights of persons, property and nationality; and by which they shall be deprived of the power to exempt any property from taxation; or to make any distinctions directly or indirectly among citizens in taxation for the support of government; or to give or loan the public property or credit to individuals or corporations to promote any enterprise whatever.

A reform in the system of criminal jurisprudence, by which the death penalty shall no longer be inflicted—by which the hardened criminal shall have no human chance of being let loose to harass society until the term of the sentence, whatever that may be, shall have expired, and by which, during that term, the entire prison employment shall be for—and the product thereof be faithfully

paid over to—the support of the criminal's family; and by which our so-called prisons shall be virtually transformed into vast reformatory workshops, from which the unfortunate may emerge to be useful members of society, instead of the alienated citizens they now are.

The institution of such supervisory control and surveillance over the now low orders of society as shall compel them to industry, and provide for the helpless, and thus banish those institutions of pauperism and beggary which are fastening upon the vitals of society, and are so prolific of crime and suffering in certain communities.

The organization of a general system of national education, which shall positively secure to every child of the country such an education in the arts, sciences and general knowledge as will render them profitable and useful members of society, and the entire proceeds of the public domain should be religiously devoted to this end.

Such change in our general foreign policy as shall plainly indicate that we realized and appreciate the important position which has been assigned us as a nation by the common order of civilization; which shall indicate our supreme faith in that form of government which emanates from, and is supported, by the whole people, and that such government must eventually be uniform throughout the world; which shall also have in view the establishment of a Grand International Tribunal, to which all disputes of peoples and nations shall be referred for final arbitration and settlement, without appeal to arms; said Tribunal maintaining only such an International army and navy as would be 40J necessary to enforce its decrees, and thus secure the return of the 15,000,000 of men who now compose the standing armies of the world, to industrial and productive pursuits.

A reform by which the functions of government shall be limited to the enactment of general law; and be absolutely prohibited from enacting any special law upon any pretext whatever; by which all laws shall be repealed which are made use of by government to interfere with the rights of adult individuals to pursue happiness as they may choose; or with the legitimate consequences of such pursuit; or with contracts between individuals, of whatever kind, or their consequences, which will place the intercourse of persons with each other upon their individual honor, with no appeal, and the intercourse of the general people upon the principles of common honesty; which will a nearer approach to self-government and a wider departure from arbitrary control than has ever been exemplified. And finally, that all legislative action shall be approved by the people before becoming law.

Thus in the best sense do I claim to be the friend and exponent of the most complete equality to which humanity can attain; of the broadest individual freedom compatible with the public good, and that supreme justice which shall know no distinction among citizens upon any ground whatever,

in the administration and the execution of the laws; and also, to be a faithful worker in the cause of human advancement; and especially to be the co-laborer with those who strive to better the condition of the poor and friendless; to secure to the great mass of working people the just reward of their toil—I claim from these, and from all others in the social scale, that support in the bold political course I have taken which shall give me the strength and the position to carry out these needed reforms, which shall secure to them, in return, the blessing which the Creator designed the human race should enjoy.

If I obtain this support, woman's strength and woman's will, with God's support, if He vouchsafe it, shall open to them, and to this country, a new career of greatness in the race of nations, which can only be secured by that fearless course of truth from which the nations of the earth, under despotic male governments, have so far departed.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL. New York, January 10, 1871.